

The Gazette of India

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 34] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 21, 1954

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published up to the 14th August 1954:—

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
[176	S. R. O. 2591, dated the 9th August, 1954.	Election Commission, India.	To fill the vacancy caused by the death of Shri Govindji Mavji in the Electoral College for the State of Kutch of the Ghadgsia Council of States Constituency.
	S. R. O. 2592, dated the 9th August, 1954.	Ditto.	Appointments of dates for bye-election in the Ghadgsia Council of States Constituency in the State of Kutch.
177	S. R. O. 2671, dated the 11th August, 1954.	Reserve Bank of India.	Amendments made in the Notification No. F.E.R.A. 105/51-R.B. (S.R.O. 263), dated the 27th February 1951.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of this Gazette.

PART II—Section 3

Statutory Rules and Orders issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and Central Authorities (other than the Chief Commissioners).

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2674.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section I of the Shillong (Rifle Range and Umlong) Cantonments Assimilation of Laws Act, 1954 (31 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints the 16th day of August 1954, as the date on which the said Act shall come into force.

[No. 28/11/52-Judicial.]

M. GOPAL MENON, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 14th August 1954

S.R.O. 2675.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the **Foreigners Act, 1946 (XXXI of 1946)**, the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made to the **Foreigners Order, 1948**, namely:—

After paragraph 5 of the said Order, the following paragraph shall be inserted, namely:—

“5A. *Power to examine persons.*—The civil authority may examine any person who seeks leave to enter India or to depart therefrom or during his stay in India for the purposes of the **Foreigners Act, 1946**, or of any Order made thereunder; and it shall be the duty of every such person to furnish to the civil authority such information, in such manner and at such times, as that authority may require.”

[No. 9/3/54-F.II.]

FATEH SINGH, Dy. Secy.

ORDER

New Delhi, the 12th August 1954

S.R.O. 2676.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 63 of the **Andhra State Act, 1953 (30 of 1953)**, the President hereby requires all persons specified by name in column (1) or by official designation in column (2) of the Schedule to this Order, to serve in connection with the affairs of the **State of Andhra**, as allotted officers or as transferred officers, as stated in the corresponding entries in column (3) of the said Schedule.

SCHEDULE

Name	Official Designation	Allotted Officer or Transferred Officer
(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Madras Cooperative Department</i>		
Sri T. Manavala Naidu . . .	Cooperative Sub Registrar . . .	Allotted Officer.
Sri K. Vengama Naidu . . .	Junior Inspector of Cooperative Societies.	Do.
<i>Madras State Soldiers', Sailors' and Airmen's Board</i>		
Sri E. P. Govindan Nambiar . . .	Upper Division Clerk . . .	Transferred Officer.
Sri V. Balakrishnan . . .	Lower Division Clerk . . .	Do.
Sri J. Krishnamurthy . . .	Lower Division Clerk . . .	Allotted Officer.
<i>Central Survey Office, Madras</i>		
Sri A. Bhaskara Rao . . .	Typist . . .	Allotted Officer.
<i>Madras Public Works Department</i>		
<i>Non-Gazetted—Technical</i>		
Sri D. Radhakrishnamurthy . . .	Wharf Superintendent . . .	Allotted Officer.
Sri V. Subba Rao . . .	Lock Superintendent . . .	Do.
Sri Abdul Majeed Khan Lodi . . .	Junior Engineer . . .	Do.
<i>Non-Gazetted—Ministerial</i>		
Sri D. Suryanarayana . . .	Head Clerk . . .	Allotted Officer.
Sri C. S. Subramaniam . . .	Upper Division Clerk . . .	Do.
Sri N. Venkatasubbiah . . .	Lower Division Clerk . . .	Do.

(1)	(2)	(3)
<i>Madras Civil Supplies Department</i>		
Sri B. A. Sundararajan . . .	Acting Upper Division Clerk, Allotted Officer. Office of the Collector of Madras, Rationing Branch.	
<i>Madras Transport Department</i>		
<i>Office of the Transport Commissioner (Nationalisation), Madras</i>		
Sri V. Rajagopal . . .	Junior Superintendent . . .	Allotted.
Sri L. Srinivasalu . . .	Cash-keeper . . .	Do.
Sri J. Bakthavatsalu . . .	Do.	Do.
Sri M. A. Rawoof . . .	Lower Division Clerk . . .	Do.
Sri V. Narasimhan . . .	Do.	Do.
Sri S. Subramania Iyer . . .	Do.	Do.
Sri B. Y. Papiiah . . .	Do.	Do.
Sri S. Kandaswami . . .	Do.	Do.
Sri C. Venkatesalu . . .	Do.	Do.
<i>Office of the Central Road Traffic Board</i>		
Sri E. Lakshmipathi . . .	Lower Division Clerk . . .	Do.
Sri P. Rangaswarni . . .	Do.	Do.
<i>Regional Transport Office, Chingleput</i>		
Sri S. Govindarajulu . . .	Junior Superintendent . . .	Do.

[No. 26/4/53-AIS(I).]

N. N. CHATTERJEE, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS*New Delhi, the 14th August 1954*

S.R.O. 2677.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 8 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (XLI of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that notwithstanding anything contained in Schedule I to the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Fees) Rules, 1949, as amended by the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of External Affairs No. S.R.O. 9, dated the 22nd December 1953, a fee of Re. 1 per certificate shall be charged from Indians ordinarily resident in Malaya and originating from one of the old Indian States applying not later than the 31st August 1954, to the Representative of the Government of India in Malaya, Singapore, for certificates of registration as citizens of India under Article 8 of the Constitution.

[No. 511-Cons.]

I. S. CHOPRA, Joint Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS**ORDER***New Delhi, the 16th August 1954*

S.R.O. 2678.—In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 160 of the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby exempts for a further period upto 31st December, 1954, applicants for first class Navigators licence from the operation of sub-paragraph (2) of paragraph I of Section E of Schedule II of

the said Rules in so far as the said sub-paragraph requires such persons to hold a second class Navigator's licence for at least one year and to produce evidence of having had at least four years air experience.

[No. 10-A/58-54.]

K. V. VENKATACHALAM, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE
(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 14th August 1954

S.R.O. 2679.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Companies Act, 1949 (X of 1949), the Central Government on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India hereby declares that the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 19 of the said Act shall not, for the period ending on the 31st December, 1954, apply to the Hongkong & Shanghai Banking Corporation, Calcutta, in respect of its holding of the shares of the Sun Jute Press Limited.

[No. F.4(4)-F.I/54]

N. C. SEN GUPTA, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE (REVENUE DIVISION)

New Delhi, the 21st August 1954

S.R.O. 2680.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 (VIII of 1878), the Central Government hereby makes the following rule, the same having been previously published as required under sub-section (3) of the said section, namely:—

RULE

The Customs Duties Drawback (Cotton Cloth and Yarn) Rules, 1953 published with the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance (Revenue Division), No. 92, dated the 26th November, 1953, are hereby rescinded and shall be deemed always to have been rescinded with effect from the 15th June, 1954.

[No. 87.]

CUSTOMS

S.R.O. 2681.—The following draft of certain amendments in the Customs Duties Drawback (Embroidered Goods) Rules, 1954, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by section 43B of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 (VIII of 1878), is published, as required by sub-section (3) of the said section, for the information of persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration after one month from the date of the publication of this notification in the official Gazette.

2. Any objection or suggestion which may be received by the undersigned from any person with respect to the said draft before the date specified will be considered by the Central Government.

Amendments

In rule 5 of the said rules—

- (i) in sub-rule (2), for the word "nominate" the words "authorise in this behalf" shall be substituted; and for the words "Nominated Chief Customs Officer", the words "Authorised Chief Customs Officer" shall be substituted; and
- (ii) in sub-rule (4), for the words "Nominated Chief Customs Officer" the words "Authorised Chief Customs Officer" shall be substituted.

[No. 89.]

JASJIT SINGH, Dy. Secy.

ORDER

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2682.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (a) of sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (II of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the whole of the stamp duty chargeable under article 27 of the said Act on debenture of Rs. 20,00,000 to be issued by the Municipal Committee, Amravati, to the United Western Bank Limited, Satara.

[No. 8-Stamp.]

M. G. MATHUR, Under Secy.

ESTATE DUTY

New Delhi, the 16th August 1954

S.R.O. 2683.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Estate Duty Act, 1953 (34 of 1953), the Central Government hereby appoints the persons whose names are given in the Appendix as valuers for the purposes of the said Act for a period of three years from the date of this notification:

Provided that any valuer whose appointment expires by efflux of time shall be eligible for re-appointment if he satisfies the conditions relating to the appointment of valuers for the time being in force.

The scale of charges for the remuneration of valuers appointed by the Central Government for valuing any property shall be as fixed below, and no such valuer shall charge a fee at a scale higher than the scale so fixed.

Scale of Charges

On the first Rs. 50,000 of the property so valued— $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the value.

On the next Rs. 1,00,000 of the property so valued— $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. of the value.

On the balance of the property so valued— $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent. of the value.

APPENDIX

I.—Engineers/Surveyors/Architects

S. No.	Name	Address
1	Shri Bose, Akshoy, B.E., C.E., M.I.E., (India).	Wellesley House, Wellesley Place, Calcutta.
2	Shri Bose, Benoy Krishna, B.E., M.I.E., M.R. San. I. (Lond.)	10, Hastings Street, Calcutta-1.
3	Shri Bhaduri, Birendranath, B.Sc. (Engg.) A.C.G.I., A.M.I., C.E., M.I.E.	Executive Engineer (Roads), Survey Div. No. II, Anderson House, Alipore, Calcutta-27.
4	Shri Banerjee, B. K., B.E., C.E., A.M.I.E.	7, Old Post Office Street, (Ground Floor), Calcutta-1.
5	Shri Bose, D. K., B.E., C.E., A.M.I.E.	Wellesley House, 7, Wellesley Place, Calcutta.
6	Shri Bose, Himansu Ranjan, B.E., M.I.E.	10, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
7	Shri Bhar, Harimohan B.E. (Civil)	Technical Adviser, Office of the Pre-partition Compensation Claims (Defence Service) Committee for East Bengal, Ministry of Defence, Govt. of India, 11, Sterndale Road, Calcutta.
8	Shri Barber, Herbert Eustace, F.R.I.C.S., M.I.E., M.I.S.	C/o Talbot & Co., Surveyors, Tower House, Chowringhee Square, Calcutta-1.
9	Shri Banerjee, Kala Chand, B.E., C.E., M.I.E.	12, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
10	Shri Biswas, Ranjit, B.Sc. (Engg.)	22, Jatin Das Road, Calcutta-29.
11	Shri Banerjee, Sushil Kumar, B.E. C.E., A.M.I.E.	30/C, South End Park, Calcutta-29.

S. No.	Name	Address
12	Shri Chaudhuri, B. N., B.E., M.I.E., M.R.S.I. (Lond.).	M.R. 10, Hastings Street, Calcutta-1.
13	Shri Chakravarti, Sudhansu Coomar, B.E., C.E., A.M.I.E.	93/1, Garpar Road, Calcutta-9.
14	Shri Chakravorty, Sudhir Chandra, B.E., M.I.E.	C/o The Chief Engineer, Eastern Command, Ranchi.
15	Shri Datta, A. K., B.E., C.E., M.I.E., (India), M.I.R.C., M.A.E.	5, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
16	Shri Dutt, Sushil Kumar, A.M.I.E.	1-B, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
17	Shri Datta, Sudhamoy, B.E., M.I.E.	204/1, R.B. Avenue, Calcutta-29.
18	Shri De, Sukumar, B.Sc., A.R.I.C.E.	102-A, Ashotosh Mukerjee Road, Calcutta-25.
19	Shri De, Santosh Kumar, B.E., A.M.I.E.	6, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
20	Shri Ghosh, Amal Kumar, B.Sc.	14, Paikpara Row, Calcutta-37.
21	Shri Ganguli, Bholanath B.E., C.E.,	10C, Govt. Place, East Calcutta-1.
22	Shri Ganguly, J., B.E., M.I.E., M.I.S.	Lindie Chambers, 6 Hastings Street, Calcutta.
23	Shri Ghose, T. K., B.Sc., M.I.E., M.A.E., C.P.E.	1-B, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
24	Shri Ghosh, Saroj Kumar, B.E., A.M.I.E.	7, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
25	Shri Ghose, Sudhindra Nath, B.E., C.E., A.M.I.E., M.R.S.I.	Builders' Syndicate, 8-2, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
26	Shri Ghosh, Chittapriya, B.Sc. (Cal.), B.E. (Civil), A.M.I.E. (India).	Staff Officer (Planning, Eastern Command, Ranchi-11.
27	Shri Keir, W.I., A.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	Artistry House, 15 Park Street, Calcutta-16.
28	Shri Mitra, A. N., A.M.I., Min.E. (Glas.)	Shanti-Bitan, P. O. Nutandanga, via Pandavaswar, Burdwan.
29	Shri Majumdar, Benoyendra, B.Sc. (Glas.), A.M.I.E. (Ind.)	15, Rowland Road, Calcutta-20.
30	Shri Mukhopadhyay, Prabhdas Kumar, A.M.I.E.	45, S.R., Das Road, Kalighat, Calcutta.
31	Shri Mahajan, Shankerdas, B.Sc., (Engg.), M.I.E.	Deputy Director, Land, Hiring & Disposals, Eastern Command, 1, Sterndale Road, Alipur, Calcutta-27.
32	Shri Mukherjee, Satyapada, B.Sc., B.E., C.E.	Builders' Syndicate, 8-2, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
33	Shri Mullick, Uditindu Prakash, B.E., B.Sc. C.E., A.M.I.E.	C/o Hope Johnstone & Son, 9 Hastings Street, Calcutta.
34	Shri Neogi, Janendra Nath, B.E., C.E., A.M.I.E.	16-2, Mohendra Bose Lane, Calcutta.
35	Shri Paul, Kiron Chandra, B.Sc. (Cal.), B.Sc. (Glas.) A.M.A.E., A.M.I.E.	1-B, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
36	Shri Roy, Bhabatosh, B.E.	10, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.
37	Shri Sen, Anil Kumar, A.M.I.S.E., (Lond.)	Lake Road, Ranchi.
38	Shri Sarbadhikary, D.N., B.E., M.I.E., (Ind.)	10, Old Post Office Street, (2nd Floor), Calcutta.
39	Shri Sarkar, Hiran Kumar, B.E., C.E.	9, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
40	Shri Thomas, Henry Carlton, B.A., A.R.I.C.S.	10, Elliot Road, Calcutta.
41	Shri Aga, A.M., B.E. (Civil)	Ismail Building, Flora Fountain, Fort Bombay.
42	Shri Aga, Jamshed Burjor, F.R.I.B.A., M.I.S.C., F.I.I.A., L.C.E., M.I.E.	Advani Chambers, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay-1.
43	Shri Baria, E. J. N., F.I.A.A. (Lond.), B.E. (Civil), M.I.E., (India), A.M.I.S.E. (Lond.)	C/o Kapadia & Baria, Ballard House, Jame Jamshed Office, 14, Mangalore Street, Fort, Bombay.
44	Shri Bodhe, J. G., B.E., M.I.S.E. (Lond.), J.P.	24-26, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay.
45	Shri Bhandarkar, M.S., B.E., A.M.I.E.	50, Western India House, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
46	Shri Bhide, T. R., A.I.I.A.	C/o Jamnadas & Bhide, 134, Meadows St., Bombay.
47	Shri Buchia, S. N., A.R.I.B.A., M.I.S.E.	C/o Chinoy, Buchia & Dveshia, 11, Bruce Street, Fort, Bombay.

S. No.	Name	Address
48	Shri Barma, Saleh Tyobjee, B.Sc.	C/o Barma & Co., 'Examiner' Building 109, Medows Street, Bombay.
49	Shri Claude Batley, F.R.I.B.A.	C/o Gregson, Batley & King, Chartered Bank Building, Bombay-1.
50	Shri Chowdhari D.R., A.R.I.B.A.	Ditto.
51	Shri Chitalia, S.D., F.I.I.A.	Mehta Building, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.
52	Shri Castellino, S.J., A.R.I.B.A.	Office of the Chief Engineer, National Defence Academy Project, Poona.
53	Shri Doctor B.H., F.R.I.B.A. (Lond.), F.I.I.A., M.R.San. I. (Lond.)	'Dhannur', Sir P. Mehta Rd., Fort, Bombay-1.
54	Shri Dadurkar, G.S., A.R.I.B.A. (Lond.)	Bell & Co.'s Premises, 19, Sir, P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
55	Shri Dallas, Homi N., F.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	C/o Parekar & Dallas, Medows House, Medows Street, Bombay-1.
56	Shri Desai, H.R., B.E., A.M.I.E.	C/o Desai Shah Construction Co., Raopura Road, Baroda.
57	Shri Doshi, H.G., B.E., M.I.E.	26, Imperial Chambers, Wilson Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay.
58	Shri Divecha, Krishnaram T., M.I.E., A.I.A.A. (Lond.)	C/o Sykes Patker & Divecha, 24-26, Dalal Street, Fort Bombay.
59	Shri Dave, M.B., G.D. Arch., F.I.I.A.	24, Residency, Baroda-2.
60	Shri Dadachanji, S.P.II., B.A., B.E. (Civil).	Motlibai House, 22-D, Parsec Bazar Street, Fort, Bombay.
61	Shri Engineer, M.T., B.A., B.E. (Civil)	79, Medows Street, Fort Bombay.
62	Shri Engineer, Rustam K., B.E. (Civil)	C/o Dhunjishaw Dhedwar & Co., Behramji Mansion, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
63	Shri Gajjar, B.G., A.I.A.A. (Lond.), A.I.I.A.	Lal Bhuwan, Relief Road, Ahmedabad.
64	Shri Gandhi, C.H., B.Sc. (Eng.) A.M.I.E., M.I. Struct. E.	45-47, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.
65	Shri Gupte, G.S., B.A., L.C.E., M.I.E.	Yusuf Building, 49, Churchgate Street, Fort, Bombay.
66	Shri Gupte, M.G., A.R.I.B.A., A.I.I.A.	Ditto.
67	Shri Gobhai, N.M., L.C.E., M.I.E.	C/o K.P. Davar & Co., Churchgate House, 32-34 Veer Nariman Road, Fort, Bombay.
68	Shri Harsora, D.D., G.D. Arch., A.I.I.A., A.I.A.A. & S. (Lond.)	C/o Abdulla Peermohamed, Sardar Mansion, 22, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
69	Shri Hingorany, R.J., B.E., A.M.I.E.	R.J. Hingorany & Co., First Floor, Meher House, 15 Cowasji Patel Street, Fort, Bombay.
70	Shri Habibullah Khan, F.R.I.C.S., A.I.-A.A. & S., A.I.I.A.	Room No. 4, First Floor, Western India House, Laxmi Road, Poona-2.
71	Shri Joshi, A.K., B.E. (Civil)	Sholapur Municipality.
72	Shri Junnarkar, B.V., B.E., A.M.I.E.	C/o Junnarkar & Gupta, Yusuf Building, 49, Churchgate Street, Bombay.
73	Shri Joshi, S.B., B.E., M.I.E.	166-D, Hindu Colony, Vincent Road. Satjangad, Dadar, Bombay-14.
74	Shri King, H. Foster, F.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.-P.I.	C/o Gregson Batley and King, Chartered Bank Building, Bombay-1.
75	Shri Kyum, Mohamadbhoy Abdool, P. Sc., (Engg).	C/o Barma & Co., "Examiner Building" 109, Medows Street, Bombay.
76	Shri Kamtekar, G.A., B.A., B. Sc. (Bom.) B. Sc. (Edin.), M.I.E. (India).	50, Western India House, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
77	Shri Katrak, H.N., B.E. (Civil)	Kamar Building, 4th Floor, 38, Cowasji Patel Street, Fort, Bombay.
78	Shri Kotasthane, K.M., A.R.I.B.A., A.I.I.A., J.P.	55, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
79	Shri Katrak, K.N., L.C.E., A.M.I.E.	Cama House, No. 24, Dalal Fort, Bombay.
80	Shri Kuvadia, N.C. B.E., A.M.I.E.	C/o N.C. Kuvadia & Co., People's Building, Top Floor, Sir, P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.

S. No.	Name	Address
81	Shri Kapadia, P.P., O.B.E., J.P., F.R.I.-B.A., B.A., B.E. (Civil), M.I. Struc. E., M.I.E. (India).	Ballard House, Jame Jamshed Office, 14, Mangalore Street, Fort, Bombay.
82	Shri Kale, C. G., B.A., B. Sc., B. E., M.I.E., C.I.E.	"Swagat" Poona-4.
83	Shri Khamesra, P.S., M.I.E., I.S.E. (Retd.)	P.O. Adipur (Kutch) Kutch.
84	Shri Kini, S.M., B.Sc., B.E., M.I.E., M. Am. Soc., C.E.	C/o Shrinivas M. Kini and Co., 134, Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay.
85	Shri Kanhere, V.P., B.E., B.S.E., II (Retd.)	Consulting Engineering, 129, Shukrawar Peth, Poona-2.
86	Shri Kothari, V.C., B.E.	Porbandar Municipality, Porbandar.
87	Shri Lalaji, Biharilal Ochhavilal, B.E. (Civil), A.M.I.E.	Balaji Road, Surat.
88	Shri Mhatre, Baburao D., G.D. Arch., F.I.I.A., A.I.A.A. & S. (London).	Bombay Mutual Building, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
89	Shri Marathe, D.N., B.E. (Civil), A.M.I.E.	C/o Marathe and Kulkarni, Surya Mahal, 5, Military Square Lane, Fort, Bombay.
90	Shri Motafram, Jamshed D., A.R.I.B.A., A.I.I.A.	Crescent Chambers, Tamarind Lane, Fort, Bombay.
91	Shri Merchant, Merwanji Nanabhoy, B.E., A.M.I.E., AM.I. Struc. E.	Medhora Block, 4 East Street, Poona 1.
92	Shri Mehta, R.T., B.E. (Civil)	41, Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay.
93	Shri Mehendaley, R.G., B.E.	Gole Colony, Nasik.
94	Shri Merchant, V.H., A.M.S.E., A.M.I.E.T.	C/o V.H. Merchant and Co., 54, 3rd Bhoiwada, Bhuleshwar, Bombay-2.
95	Shri Merchant, Yahya C., A.A.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	Prospect Chambers Annexe, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
96	Shri Nandwana, Lakhaji Kalabhai, A.R.I.-B.A., F.I.A.A.	Opp. Telegraph Office, Bhadra, Ahmedabad.
97	Shri Nadkarni, N.V., B.E. (Civil), B. Sc. (Bom.), A.M.I.E.	Belgaum, Bombay.
98	Shri Nadkarni, S.K., B.E., A.M.I.E.	C/o Nadkarni & Co., Ash Lane, Fort, Bombay.
99	Shri Narwekar, S.J., F.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	Crescent Chamber, Tamarind Lane, Fort, Bombay.
100	Shri Patell, Burjor Ardeshir, L.C.E.	C/o B.A. Patell and Co., Examiner Building, 109, Meadows Street, Bombay.
101	Shri Pancholi, D.B., B.E. (Civil), A.M.-I.E.	Zalawad District, Jorawarnagar, (Saurashtra).
102	Shri Peermahomed, Abdulla Bhanji, A.R.I.B.A. (London).	C/o Abdulla Peermahomed and Co., Sardar Mansion, 22, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
103	Shri P.A.d' Avoine, F.R.I.B.A.	Gregson Batley and King, Chartered Bank Building, Bombay-1.
104	Shri Palkar, Dinkar Ramchandra, B.E. (Civil).	Karmarkar's Wada, Peth Bhag, Sangli.
105	Shri Patki, J.G., A.R.I.B.A. (London) J.P.	Bell and Co.'s Premises, 19, Sir P. Mehta Road Fort, Bombay.
106	Dr. Parekh, Jagannath Prabhudas, B.E. (Bom.), Ph. D. (Edin), A.M.I.E. (India).	Ali Chambers, Chamber No. 40, Meadows Street and Tamarind Lane, Fort, Bombay.
107	Shri Patell, Khurshed Ardeshir, A.R.I.B.A.	Examiner Building, 109, Meadows Street, Bombay.
108	Shri Parelkar, K.A., A.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	C/o Parelkar Gore Parpia, Prospect Chambers Annexe, Fort, Bombay.
109	Shri Patkar, P.M., Dip. in Arch., A.R.I.B.A.	56, Gomdevi Road, Bombay-7.
110	Shri Pastakia, Rustom Hormusji, F.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A., J.P.	42, Lakshmi Building, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
111	Shri Paclkar, S.J., F.R.I.B.A. F.I.I.A.	Meadows House, Meadows Street, Bombay-1.
112	Shri Pandit, S.V., B.E.	C/o Pandit Bros., Shivalal Motilal Mansion, 14, Hammam Street, Fort, Bombay.
113	Shri Patke V.M., A.R.I.B.A., F.I.I.A.	C/o Sykes Fatker and Divecha 24-26, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay.

Serial No.	Name	Address
114	Shri Ramsinh, Kumar, F.R.I.B.A.	C/O Gregson, Batley and King, Chartered Bank Building, Bombay.
115	Shri Panade, S.N., B.E.	540, Shanwar Peth, Poona-2.
116	Shri Sant, P.V., B.E., A.M.I.E.	"Manik Jyoti", Jangli Maharaj Road, Poona-4.
117	Shri Shah, C.J., B.E., M.I.E.	C/O Shah and Sanghavi, Fort Chambers, Hummam Street, Fort, Bombay.
118	Shri Sanghavi, C.O., B.E., M.I.E.	Ditto.
119	Shri Sukhatankar, D.D., B.E. (Civil)	1170/4, J.M. Road, Poona-5.
120	Shri Soparkar, G.B., F.R.I.C.S., L.C.E., M.I.E.	Summan Vihar Laxminagar, 8th Road, Khar, Bombay.
121	Shri Shroff, Jehangir, C., B.E., B. Sc., D.K.C., A.M.I.E.	Prospect Chambers Annexe, Hornby Road, Bombay.
122	Shri Shroff, P.D., B.E., L.C.E.	Sardar Mansion, 22, Apollo Street, Bombay.
123	Shri Sahasrabudhe, K.M., B.E., L.S.G.D	623/20, Sadashiv Peth, Poona.
124	Shri Sanjana, N.P., B. Sc., B.E., A.M.I. Struc. E., M.R. San. I.	Bhada Building, Procter Street, Grant Road, Bombay-7.
125	Shri Sane, R.D., G.D. Arch. F.I.I.A.	Sane and Paymaster, Prospect Chambers, Annexe, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
126	Shri Tarapore, D.V., A.R.I.B.A.	Bhotawala Building, 7-10, Horaiman Circle, Fort, Bombay.
127	Shri Taraporvala, K.B., I.R.I.B.A., A. M.I. Struc. E.	Bhotawala Buildings, 7-10, Horaiman Circle, Fort, Bombay.
128	Shri Tandon, Ram Chandra, B. Sc. (Hons) (Mansh). A.M.I.C.E. (London).	Hasan Chambers, Parsee Bazar Street, Fort, Bombay.
129	Shri Tulpule, H.K., B.E. (Civil) A.M.I.E. (India).	631/28, Sadashiv Peth, Poona-2.
130	Shri Vakil, J.N., B.E. (Civil), A.M.I.C.E. (London), M.R. San. I (London), M.I. E. (India).	Motlibai House, 22-D Parsee Bazar Street, Fort, Bombay.
131	Shri Vakil, M.M. B. Sc., B.E., A.M.I.E.	C/O Dalal and Mehta, 41, Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay.
132	Dr. Vadhelvala, R.M., Ph. D., B.E.	C/O Kora and Bhatt, 22, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay.
133	Shri Ahluwalia, Devi Chand, C.E., A.M.I. Struct. E. (Lond.)	179-5, Bank Road, Ambala Cantt.
134	Shri Bhanwra, Bhulla Ram, A.M. Tech. I. (G. Britain).	C/O Associated Engineering Co., Simla.
135	Shri Badri Das, C.E., A.M.I.E.	CK 21/21 Gopal Das Sahu Street, Banaras.
136	Shri Bawa Natha Singh, C.E.	14, Hailey Road, New Delhi.
137	Shri Gupta, Shanti Suvan, C.E.	5C/4, Rohtrak Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi.
138	Shri Jayakar, Dinkar Narayan, B. Sc. (Bombay), B.Sc. (Edin.) M.I.E.	16, Jehangirabad Mansions, Outram Road, Lucknow.
139	Shri Kathuria, Bhojraj L. B.E. (Bom.) M.R. San. I. (Lond.)	Kathuria House, Rani Bazar, Bikaner (Rajasthan).
140	Shri Khosla, Guranditta Mal, A.M. Inst., C.E.	11/4, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi.
141	Shri Kothari, Naren Kuverji, F.I.I.A.	5/G 2 Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
142	Shri Maithal, Kabool Chand, B. Sc. (Agra), A.M.I.M.M. (London), A.I.S. M., M.M.G.I.	8A/73, Pusa Road, Karol Bagh, New Delhi.
143	Shri Madho Prasad, A.M.I.St.E., F.R.S.A.	Morganj, Saharanpur.
144	Shri Mathur, Ram Behari Lal, B. Sc., C.E., A.M.I.E.	7/9, Daryaganj, Delhi.
145	Shri Mehta, R.C., C.E., A.M.I.E.	52, Queensway, New Delhi.
146	Shri Mehandru, T.R., F.I.A.A., F.I.A.S. M. AM. SOC : C.E., M.I.E., A.C. G.I.	14, Ajmeri Gate Extension, New Delhi.
147	Shri Prashar, D.R. C.E., A.M.I.E.T. (Lond.)	11434, G.T. Road, Shakti Nagar, Subzi Mandi, Delhi.

Serial No.	Name	Address
148	Shri Puranik, S.V., B.E., A.M.I.S.E., A. M.I.C.E. (Lond.)	111, Choti Gawal Toli, Indore (C.I.).
149	Shri Seengal, B.P., A.M.I.S.E. (Lond.)	98, Daryaganj, Delhi.
150	Shri Sangal, B.P., B. Sc., C.E., A.M.I.E.	3231, Puniapara, Rajamandi, Agra.
151	Shri Sharma, G.C., A.R.I.B.A., A.I.I.A., A.I.A.A. & S.	28/G-2, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
152	Shri Sahgal, H.R., B. Sc., A.M.I.E.	21, South Patel Nagar, New Delhi.
153	Shri Sharma, K.L., M.I. Struct. E.(Lond.)	60, Daryaganj, Delhi.
154	Shri Siri Ram, M.I.E.	25/12, East Patel Nagar, New Delhi.
155	Shri Varma, R.K., C.E., A.M.I.E.	72-M Block, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
156	Shri Chitale, Laxman Mahadeo, F.R.I. B.A., F.I.I.A., A.M.T.P.I.	Oriental Building, Armenian Street, G.T. Madras.
157	Shri Gangadharan, G.S., B.E., A.M.I.E.	6/48, Tatabad, Coimbatore.
158	Shri Madhava Rao, Chintamani Gopala Bindu, B.E., A.M.I.E.	No. 9, Veeraswamy Mudali St. Purasawalkam, Madras-7.
159	Shri Nathan, P.L.M., A.M.I.S.E., M. Inst. R.A.	No. 8, Nathan Street, Chetput, Madras-10.
160	Shri Narasimhan, V.M. B.A., B.E., A.M. I.E., M.R. San. I.	17, T.P. Koil Street, Triplicane, Madras-5.
161	Shri Ramchandran, S. B.E., A.M.I.C.E., M.I.E.	Taikad, Trivandrum.
162	Shri Bhambri, D.R. C.E., A.M.I.E.	Takli Road, Nagpur-1.
163	Shri Chitale, D.P., B.E. (Civil), A.M.I.E.	Tikekar Road, Dhantoli, Nagpur.
164	Shri Cassad, D.P.R., B. Sc. M. Sc. (Engg.) (Lond.), M.M.G.I., M.R.S.I., M.I.E.	Shirin Lodge, Byramji Town, Nagpur-1.
165	Shri Dangoria, Chandulal C., M. Sc. (Engg.) M.I.E.	Mushirabad Road, Hyderabad Dn.
166	Shri D. Ram Singh, A.M.I.E. (India)	108, Walker Town, Secunderabad.
167	Shri Dikshit, H.G., B.E. (Civil)	Divisional Officer, Nagpur Improvement Trust, Nagpur.
168	Shri Jussawalla, J.R., B.E. (Civil), M.I.E.	Krishna Vilas, Begampet (Dn.) Hyderabad-16.
169	Shri Karra, Jagannatha Rao, B.E., A.M. I.E.	Hanuman Tekdi, Hyderabad (Dn.).
170	Shri Lokendra Bahadur, B.Sc., C.E., M.I.E.	B-17, Saifabad, Hyderabad, Dn.
171	Shri Md. Ibrahim, B.E., M.I.E.	85, A.C. Guards, Hyderabad Dn.-4.
172	Shri Thergaonkar, P.M. B.E., A.M.I.E.	Chief Valuer, Nagpur Improvement Trust, Nagpur.
173	Shri Thatte, V.P., B. Sc., B.E., A.M.I.E.	Congress Nagar, Nagpur.

II. ACCOUNTANTS]

1	Shri Aiyer, R. V., B.A., F.C.A.	8/2, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
2	Shri Banerji, S. N., F.C.A.	10, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
3	Shri Basu Amulya Chandra, B. Com., B.L., G.D.A., F.C.A.	8-2, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
4	Shri Basu, G., B.A., F.C.A., F.S.A.A., M.L.C.	6, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
5	Shri Bhattacharya G.K., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	51-B, Kailash Bose Street, Calcutta—
6	Shri Biswas S.K., F.C.A.	5, Hastings Street, Calcutta—1.
7	Shri Bose, K.C., F.C.A.	4, Fairlie Place, Calcutta—1.
8	Shri Chakravarty, B.C., G.D.A., A.C.A.	12, Old Post Office St., Top Floor, Calcutta—1.
9	Shri Chakravarti, D.N., M.A., B.L., F.C.A.	135, Canning Street, Calcutta.
10	Shri Chakravarti, J.C., B. Com., F.C.A.	14, Pollock Street, Calcutta—1.
11	Shri Chakrabarty N.C., M.A., F.C.A.	10, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
12	Shri Chatterji, A., B.A., B. Com., F.C.A.	Do.
13	Shri Chaudhuri N., B. Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Do.
14	Shri Choudhury N.C., B. Sc., F.R.E.S., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	26-C, Creek Row, Calcutta—14.
15	Shri Choudhuri U. M., B.A., F.C.A.	12/1, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
16	Shri Crooks G.R., A.C.A.	B-4, Civil Buildings, Calcutta.

Serial No.	Name	Address
17	Shri Dandeker, S.B., F.C.A.	P-36, Royal Exchange Place, Extension Radhabazar Corner, Calcutta
18	Shri Das, N.N., B.Sc., G.D.A., F.C.A.	8-2, Hastings Street, Calcutta—1.
19	Shri Davar, Minue S.C. F.S.A. A., A.C.A.	1B, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
20	Shri De, S. N., F.C.A.	9, Hastings Street, Calcutta.
21	Shri Deb, M.K., B.Sc., F.C.A.	8-2, Hastings St., 1st Floor, Room No. 21-22, Calcutta.
22	Shri Demetrius, John, F.C.A.	Avenue House, Chowringhee Square, Calcutta—6.
23	Shri Dhar, S., B. Com., F.C.A.	2, Church Lane, Calcutta.
24	Shri Dutt, S.C., F.C.A.	35, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.
25	Shri Fuller, R.U., A.C.A.	B-4, Clive Building, Calcutta.
26	Shri Ganguli, P.N., M.A., G.D.A., A.C.A.	16, Madheb Ghose Road, Salkhia, Howrah, Calcutta.
27	Shri Ghosh, N.C., F.C.A.	P-39, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta.
28	Shri Ghosh, P.K., B.Sc., F.C.A., F.S.A.A.	17, Mangee Lane, Calcutta.
29	Shri Ghose, S., B.Sc., F.C.A., A.I.C.W.A.	10, Mercantile Building, Lal Bazar, Calcutta.
30	Shri Ghosh, S. K., F.C.A. B.Sc., F.S.A.A.	10, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta.
31	Shri Guha, B.C., B. Com., F.C.A.	5 & 6, Hare Street, Calcutta.
32	Shri Guha, Roy, D.N., M.A., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	2, Church Lane, Calcutta.
33	Shri Guha, S.N., B.Sc., G.D.A., F.C.A.	34-A, Dover Road, P. O. Ballygunj, Calcutta.
34	Shri Gupta, B., B.Sc., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	Hassan Imam Road, Patna.
35	Shri Gupta, J.N., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	12-A, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
36	Shri Iyer, N. Ramaswamy, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Deputy Chief Accountant, Calcutta Port Commissioners, 15, Strand Road, Calcutta.
37	Shri Just, A.H., A.C.A.	B-4, Clive Building, Calcutta.
38	Shri Kundu Balaichand, F.C.A., B.Sc.,	13, Brahourne Road, Calcutta—1.
39	Shri Leach, R.G., A.C.A.	B-4 Clive Building, Calcutta.
40	Shri Lodha, Jaswant Singh, B. Com. LL.M., LL.B., A.C.A., F.C.A.	1-B, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
41	Shri Maitra, P.B., B.Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	K. Worah & Co. Building Jharra P. O. Distt. Munbhum.
42	Shri Majumdar, Satis-Ch., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	17/2, Jhampaker Lane, Calcutta—3.
43	Shri Master Nariman F., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	10, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
44	Shri Mazumdar, Upendrachandra, B.Sc. G.D.A., F.C.A.	G.S. Road, Shillong.
45	Shri Mitra, P.K., B.Sc., F.S.A.A., A.I.C.W.A., F.C.A.	P-7, Mission Row, Extension, Calcutta—1
46	Shri Mitter, S.K., M.A., F.C.A.	72-A, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.
47	Shri Mitra, S.N., B.Sc., B. Com., F.C.A., A.C.A.	Windsor House, P-14, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta.
48	Shri Mookerjee, S.K., G.D.A., F.C.A.	12, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta—1.
49	Shri Mukherjee S.N., A.C.A.	1-B, Old Post Office Road, Calcutta.
50	Shri Mukherjee, A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	12, Dalhousie Sq., East, Calcutta.
51	Shri Mukhopadhyay, D.N., F.C.A.	Avenue House, Chowringhee Sq., Calcutta—1.
52	Shri Naielvala Pesi, M., A.S.A.A., A.C.A.	1-B, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
53	Shri Parker, W.E., A.C.A.	B-4, Clive Building, Calcutta.
54	Shri Peat, R.M., A.C.A.	B-4, Clive Building, Calcutta.
55	Shri Ray, B.K., B.Sc., F.C.A.	14, Bentinck Street, Calcutta—1.
56	Shri Robson, T.B., A.C.A.	4-B, Clive Building, Calcutta.
57	Shri Roy, A.C., B.A., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	1-B, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
58	Shri Roy, Chowdhury, K.C., F.C.A.	4, Fairlie Place, Calcutta—1.
59	Shri Roy, J.M., F.C.A.	Temple Chambers (2nd Floor), 6, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
60	Shri Roy, N.K., M.Sc., A.S.A.A., F.C.A.	P. 33 Prinssep Street, P. O. 33, G. P. O., Calcutta.

Serial No.	Name	Address
61	Shri Roy, N.C., B. Com., LL.B., G.D.A., A.C.A.	27, Nandan Road, Calcutta—29.
62	Shri Roychoudhuri, S.K., B. Com., A.C.A.	244 B & C, Vivekananda Road, Calcutta—6.
63	Shri Rudra, A., B.Sc., B.L., G.D.A., F.C.A.	3, West Cumtee, Jalapaiguri, (W. Bengal).
64	Shri Saha, Gopal Chandra, B.Sc., F.C.A.	10, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
65	Shri Saha, H.K., B. Com., F.C.A.	23-A, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.
66	Shri Saha, R.N., B.Sc., F.C.A.	23-A, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta.
67	Shri Sen, J., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	5, Hastings St., Top Floor, Calcutta.
68	Shri Sen, P., M.A., B. Com., F.C.A.	10, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.
69	Shri Sengupta, Sitala Charan, M.A., D.G.A., F.C.A., A.C.W.A.	Do.
70	Shri Singhi, Ramchandra, B.A., F.C.A.	1-B, Old Post Office, St., Calcutta.
71	Shri Viccajee Victor F., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	Do.
72	Shri Abhyankar, B. C., F.C.A.	C/o. B. C. Abhyankar & Co., 35-36, Ali Chambers, Medows St., Fort, Bombay-1.
73	Shri Abhyankar, B. A., LL.B., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Medows House, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.
74	Shri Abarbad, R. N., F.C.A.	Grand Hotel Buildings, 1st Floor, Mirzapur Road, Lal Darwaja Road, Ahmedabad.
75	Shri Adenwala, Nariman D., F.C.A.	418, Chotalal Bhuwan, Kalbadevi Road, Fort, Bombay.
76	Shri Ailawadi, Ram Das, F.C.A.	Bombay Mutual Annexe, Gunbow St., Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
77	Shri Aiyar Arjun K. S., B. Com., G.D.A., F.S.A.A., F.C.A., F.I.C.W.A.	East & West Building, Apollo St., Bombay-1.
78	Shri Amin, Chandrakant Raojibhai, A.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
79	Shri Arashivala, J. V., F.C.A.	Meherwan Building, Sir Phirozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
80	Shri Baria, Kaikhushru E., F.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
81	Shri Bhatt, Dinubhai L., F.C.A.	65, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1.
82	Shri Bhatt, Jayantilal Lallubhai, F.C.A.	Yusuf Building, 43, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
83	Shri Bhavnagri, Ratanji N., F.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
84	Shri Billimoria, Bhikhaja S., F.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
85	Shri Billimoria, Shapoorji B., F.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
86	Shri Birdy, Bejon D., F.C.A.	National Insurance Building, 204, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
87	Shri Chokshi, Chinu Chimanlal, B. Com., F.C.A.	11, Bruce St., Fort, Bombay.
88	Shri Cole, F. A., F.C.A.	Allahabad Bank Building, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
89	Shri Dalal, R. K., B. Com., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	49-55, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
90	Shri Desai, D. D., F.C.A.	Round Building, 2nd Floor, Kalbadevi, Bombay.
91	Shri Desai, Mahendra Jamiatram, B.A., LL.B., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Model Talkies Building, Gandhi Road, Ahmedabad.
92	Shri Desai, J. T., G.D.A., F.C.A., F.C.C.S.	Meherwan Building, Sir Phirozeshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
93	Shri Desai, Nanubhai J., F.C.A.	Sir Vithaldas Chambers, 16, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
94	Shri Deshpande, Anant Venkatesh, F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	Petit Building, 359, Hornby Road, Bombay.
95	Shri Deshpande, Vaman Hai, F.C.A.	National Insurance Building, 204, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
96	Shri Doodhmal Rusi C., G. D. A., F.C.A., A.I.C.W.A., J. P., F.T.I.I.	2, Sleator House, Sleator Road, Bombay.
97	Shri Dungor Tuttonshaw D., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Jehangir Mansion, 3rd. Floor, Next to Metro Cinema, 1st Marine St., (Dhobitala) Bombay-1.
98	Shri Divan, Ramanlal Chandulal, A.C.A.	Advani Chambers, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
99	Shri Ditiwalla, J. M., F.C.A.	Nanjee Building, 17, Elphinstone Circle, Fort, Bombay.
100	Shri Dubash, M. D., F.C.A.	111, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.

Serial No.	Name	Address
101	Shri Gubbi N. S., F.C.A.	Fort Chambers, Hamam St., Fort, Bombay.
102	Shri Hansoria Pestonji Cawasji, B. Com., F.C.A., F.S.A.A., F.I.C.W.A., J.P.	Nanjee Building, 17, Elphinstone Circle, Fort, Bombay.
103	Shri Hariharan P. R., F.C.A.	70-A, Stock Exchange Building, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
104	Shri Harivallabhdas Shah Chhotalal B. Com., (G.V.), G.D.A., F.C.A.	Bharucha Building, 1st Floor, Princess St., Bombay.
105	Shri Homi B. Dhony, A.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
106	Shri Italia H. P., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Patharia Palace, 75, Mohamedali Road, Bombay.
107	Shri Jog Bhaskar Damodar, B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Sir Vithaldas Chambers, 2nd Floor, Room No. 205, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
108	Shri Joshi D.D., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Thaomal House, 2nd Floor, Corner of Cowasji Patel St. & Banaji St., Fort, Bombay.
109	Shri Joshi R. T., A.C.A.	Barva Building, Main Road, Nasik.
110	Shri Kshirsagar Kanoba S., F.C.A.	National Insurance Building, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
111	Shri Ketkar C. L., A.C.A.	Harganga Mahal, Dadar, Bombay.
112	Shri Khanolkar D. R., F.C.A.	Bell & Co's Building, Sir Phirozshah Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
113	Shri Khare V. T., F.C.A.	Maharaja Building, Girgaon, Bombay.
114	Shri Kheshwalla K. B., F.C.A.	20, Ali Chambers, Medows Street, Fort, Bombay.
115	Shri Kolatkar G. M., F.C.A.	263, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
116	Shri Korre R. E., F.C.A.	Karwar Bellary Road, Hubli.
117	Shri Kulkarni V. S., F.C.A.	National Insurance Building, 204, Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.
118	Shri Kumana Bhikaji Edulji, B. Com., G.D.A., F.C.A., F.S.A.A.	Mherwan Building, Sir P. Mehta Road, Fort, Bombay.
119	Shri Kumbhani Hakimchand Panachand, B. Com., F.C.A.	India House, 1st Floor, Opp. G.P.O., Bombay-1.
120	Shri Lakhia R., F.C.A.	Ahmedabad.
121	Shri Lalit G. T., A.C.A.	689/68, Sadashiv Path, Naruh, Bag, Poona-2.
122	Shri Mandviwalla N. R., F.C.A., F.S.A.A., F.F.C.S.	Humam House, Humam St., Fort, Bombay.
123	Shri Mani A. S., M.A., A.S.A.A. (Lond.), A.C.A.	80-81, Dr. Annie Beasant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.
124	Shri Mehta B. M., F.C.A.	41, Medows St., Fort, Bombay.
125	Shri Mehta Bhaidas M., G.D.A., F.C.A.	570-4, Reid Road, Ahmedabad.
126	Shri Mehta H. N., B. Com., F.C.A.	Ali Chambers, Medows St., Bombay-1.
127	Shri Mehta R.C., F.C.A., F.S.A.A.	Jariwala Building, Hughes Road, Bombay-7.
128	Shri Marfatia Naushir M., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Alice Building, Dr. Dadabhai Naoraji Road, P. O. Box 1190, Fort, Bombay.
129	Shri Modi N. R., F.C.A.	Allahabad Bank Building, Apollo St., Bombay-1.
130	Shri Nerurkar A. N., B. Com., A.C.A.	Plot No. 247, Behind Ruia College, Matunga, Bombay-19.
131	Shri Oka G. M., G.D.A., F.C.A.	180, Budhwar Peth, Laxmi Road, Poona-2.
132	Shri Pardiwalla, B. Com., LL.B., F.C.A.	11, Bruce St., Fort, Bombay.
133	Shri Parikh A. K., F.C.A.	Sir Vithaldas Chambers, 16, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
134	Shri Parekh Chandrakant V.	Sir Vithaldas Chambers, 16, Apollo Street, Fort, Bmbay.
135	Shri Parikh S. R., F.C.A.	Podar Chambers, 109, Parsi Bazar St., Fort, Bombay.
136	Shri Parmar Devchand H., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Jehangir Wadia Building, 51, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
137	Shri Patel M. G., F. C.A.	Central Bank Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay-1.
138	Shri Paymaster Narman R., F.C.A.	113, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Fort, Bombay.
139	Shri Shah Indulal H., F.C.A.	418, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
140	Shri Shah Jayant M., B.C., F.C.A.	Oriental Bldg., Relief Rd., Ahmedabad.
141	Shri Shah Khimji Kunverji, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Bombay Mutual Building, Hornby Rd., Fort, Bombay.

Serial No.	Name	Address
142	Shri Shah Narandas M., F.C.A.	418, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.
143	Shri Thakkar Ambala Shival, F.C.A.	East and West Building, 49, Apollo St., Fort, Bombay.
144	Shri Thakkar Jayantilal K., B. Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	111, Mahatma Gandhi Rd., Opp. Rajabai Tower, Fort, Bombay-1.
145	Shri Trivedi S. M., B., Com., A.C.A., LL.B., G.D.A.	7, Devkaran Mansions, Princess St. Bombay.
146	Shri Variava M. H., B.Com., A.C.A.	114, Mahatma Gandhi Rd., Fort, Bombay.
147	Shri Vepari Natvarlal J., D.G.A., F.C.A.	Lal Gate, Kanpith, Surat.
148	Shri Ahuja Harbans Singh, B.Com., F.C.A.	61, H. Gobin Mansion, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
149	Shri Annadhanam K. F.C.A.	4, Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6.
150	Shri Bahri P. N., G.D.A., F.C.A.	15, Rajpur Road, Dehradun.
151	Shri Bahl R. H., F.C.A.	Mirza Ismail Road, Jaipur.
152	Shri Bansal Bishan Das, B.A., B.Com., A.C.A.	Karmon Dedri, Amritsar.
153	Shri Bhadani L. C., M.Com., A.C.A.	Goga Gate, Bikaner.
154	Shri Bhalla J. C., B.A., F.C.A.	7, Prem House, Connaught Place, New Delhi.
155	Shri Bhargava Mukut Behari Lal, A.C.A.	Behind Chitra Talkies, Gwalior.
156	Shri Bhargava Meshnarain, F.C.A.	16, Jehangirabad Mansions, Hazratganj, Lucknow.
157	Shri Bhatia, A. S., B.Com., F.C.A.	Burn Bastion Road, Delhi-6.
158	Shri Bhatia Devraj, B.Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Sadar Bazar, Delhi.
159	Shri Bhatia Jagmohanlal, A.C.A.	Scindia House, Curzon Road, P. B. No. 24, New Delhi-1.
160	Shri Bhatta Ishwar Singh, G.D.A. F.C.A.	Commercial Bldg., Mahatma Gandhi Road, Kanpur.
161	Shri Chadha T. R., B.A., F.C.A.	64, Regal Building, New Delhi.
162	Shri Chandiock J. C., B.A., A.C.A., F.C.A.	Kashmere Gate, Delhi-6.
163	Shri Chaturvedi Bishamber Nath, B.Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Chaturvedi House, Kasturba Gandhi Road Kanpur.
164	Shri Chopra, S. P., F.C.A.	F. Block, Connaught Place, Radial Road No. 7, New Delhi.
165	Shri Dhawan, S. N., B.Com., F.C.A.	17, Faiz Bazar, Opp. Post Office, Delhi.
166	Shri Deshpande, S. B., V.A., F.C.A.	102/1, M. T. Cloth Market, Indore City.
167	Shri Gargiyya Bhagwandas, F.C.A.	Gargiyya Niwas, Beawar.
168	Shri Gupta M. L., B.Com., A.S.A.A., F.C.A.	161, Civil Lines, Kanpur.
169	Shri Gupta R. C., F.C.A., B.Com.	C/o R. C. Gupta & Co., Birhana Road, Kanpur.
170	Shri Gupta Sukh Nandan, B.Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	C/o S. N. Gupta & Co., Sukh-Niketan, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Agra.
171	Shri Jaiswal G.P., F.C.A., G.D.A.	G. P. Jaiswal & Co., 90, Johnstongang, Allahabad.
172	Shri Kapur A. D., F.C.A.	Civil Lines, Jullundur City.
173	Shri Kapoor Bhim Sen, F.C.A.	H. Block, Tropical Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.
174	Shri Kasbekar, S. N., F.C.A.	Bada Sarafa, Indore.
175	Shri Khanna Vishan Datt, F.C.A.	26, Faiz Bazar, Daryaganj, Delhi-7.
176	Shri Khosla D. B., B.Sc., F.C.A.	Chandni Chowk, Delhi.
177	Shri Malhotra Khushal Chand, F.C.A.	1517, Kashmere Gate, Delhi.
178	Shri Malhotra B. R., B. Com., A.S.A.A., F.C.A.	Kashmere Gate, Delhi.
179	Shri Mathur Parmeshwar Dayal, F.C.A.	Jagannath Bldg., Behind Imperial Bank of India, Chandni Chowk, Delhi.
180	Shri Marwaha R. N., F.C.A.	4/80, Queensway, New Delhi.
181	Shri Mehra P. R., G.D.A., F.C.A.	56, Daryaganj, Delhi.
182	Shri Mehrotra H. R., G.D.A., F.C.A.	15/247A, Civil Lines, Kanpur.
183	Shri Mohan Bhola Nath, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Bishwar Nath Road, Opp. Jai Hind Talkies, Lucknow.
184	Shri Raghu Nath Rai, F.C.A.	F. Block, Connaught Place, Radial Road No. 7, New Delhi-1.

Serial No.	Name	Address
185	Shri Rallan Balkishan M., G.D.A., F.C.A.	5010, Sirkiwalan, Hauzkazi, Delhi.
186	Shri Sharma D. D., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Opp. General Motor Stand, Jullundur City.
187	Shri Sodhbans P. S., F.C.A.	Dilbar Bldg., Paharganj, New Delhi.
188	Shri Tacknait S. L., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	213, Railway Road, Jullundur City.
189	Shri Talwar Amritlal, G.D.A., F.C.A.	P. O. 113, Westcott Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Kanpur.
190	Shri Tandon Pyare Lal, A.S.A.A., F.C.A.	Post Box 113, Westcott Building, The Mall, Kanpur.
191	Shri Vaish S., B.Com., LL.B., G.D.A., F.C.A.	C/o S. Vaish & Co., 161, Civil Lines, Kanpur.
192	Shri Venkataraman, M. R., A.C.A.	54, Queensway, New Delhi.
193	Shri Vidyarthi Bishan Sahai, A.C.A.	Didwanadli, Lashkar, Gwallior.
194	Shri Aiyer K. Venkatachalam, A.C.A.	"Sriniketan", Chettikulangara, P. B. No. 12, Trivandrum.
195	Shri Ashton, F.C.A.	Barrow House, 12, Mc Lean Street, Madras-1.
196	Shri Blankinsop N., F.C.A.	Barrow House, 12, Mc Lean St., Madras.
197	Shri Cheriyar V. K., B.Com., A.C.A.	Valanjar House, Chetty Street, Koyyayam.
198	Shri Desai V. M., A.C.A.	16, Moore, Street, Madras-1.
199	Shri Hegde P. M., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Kodialbail P. O., Manalore (S. I.).
200	Shri Iyer G. S. Ramchandra, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Kalpathi—Palghat.
201	Shri Jagannathan M. S., G.D.A., F.C.A.	P. B. No. 729, Rathnasabapathipuram, P.O. Coimbatore.
202	Shri Kaimal K. R., B.A., A.S.A.A. A.C.A.	C/o Varma & Varma, Chartered Accountants, Alwaye.
203	Shri Kandeker, G. M., B.A., F.S.A.A., F.C.A.	16, Moore Street, Madras-1.
204	Shri Kannappan K., F.C.A.	Barrow House, 12, McLean St., Madras-1.
205	Shri Kuppusswamy, Krishan, F.C.A.	Room 23, Bombay Mutual Bldg. Annexe, 322, Linghi Chetty St., Madras.
206	Shri Menon T. K., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Chalapuram, Koshikode-2.
207	Shri Minakshisundaram T. C., B.A., G.D.A.F., C.A.	161, Mount Road, Madras-2.
208	Shri Mankeshwar K. K., F.C.A.	C/o Verma and Verma, New Road, Cochin.
209	Shri Natesan G., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Dabir Middle Street, Kumakonam.
210	Shri Poti Venkatachalam M., B.A., B.L., A.C.A.	Sreerengam, Easwari Vilasam Road, Jagathy, Trivandrum.
211	Shri Purushottam B., F.C.A.	2/19, Armenian St., Madras.
212	Shri Ramchandran D., B.Sc., F.C.A.	P. B. No. 1354, Madras-1.
213	Shri Rangaswamy, M. S., B.A., G.D.A., A.C.A.	C/o M/s. M. S. Krishnaswamy & Jagannathan, Tennur, Triruchirapalli.
214	Shri Rao C. P. Krishna, G.D.A., A.C.A.	6, Gopalapuram 2nd St., Cathedral Post, Madras.
215	Shri Rao, K. Krishna, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Rukminesa Bhavanam, Venkataratnapuram-Kakinada.
216	Shri Rao, R. N. Pampa, F.C.A.	Adoni.
217	Shri Ramchandrarao K., F.C.A.	Innespect, Rajahmundry.
218	Shri Rao Umanath A., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Kodialbail, Mangalore-3.
219	Shri Sankran N., G.D.A., F.C.A.	National Insurance Bldg., Esplanade, Madras.
220	Shri Sarovar D. V., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Bellary.
221	Shri Sastri S. C., F.C.A., F.S.A.A.	15, Armenian Street, Madras-1.
222	Shri Sadagopan K., B.A., F.C.A.	P. O., 1354, Madras-1.
223	Shri Sivaramkrishnan, C. S., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Old Kalapathy, Kalpathy-Palghat.
224	Shri Srinivasan M. S., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	P. B. 729, Rathnasabapathipuram, P. O. Coimbatore.
225	Shri Srinivasan R., B.A., A.C.A.	5, Sambasivam St., T. Nagar, Madras-17.

Serial No.	Name	Address
226	Shri Subbaraman S., B.A., F.C.A., G.D.A.	National Insurance Bldg., Esplanade, Madras.
227	Shri Subramanian K., B.A., F.C.A.	10, Perumal Tank Sq., Madurai.
228	Shri Subramanyam N. V., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	55, Second Agraharam, Salem.
229	Shri Suryanarayan S., F.C.A.	P. B., 1354, Madras-1.
230	Shri Thomas O., B. Com., A.C.A.	Kottayam.
231	Shri Varma Kerala, G.D.A., M.A., F.C.A.	C/o Varma & Varma, 8/24, Rice Bazar, Trichur.
232	Shri Varma Kerala, B.A., B.Com., G.D.A., F.C.A.	C/o Varma & Varma, New Road, Cochin-2.
233	Shri Venkata Das T., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	Satyanarayanapuram, Vijayavade-2.
234	Shri Venkataraman S., B.Sc., F.C.A.	P. B. 1354, Madras-1.
235	Shri Venkataraman S., B.A., F.C.A.	22, Banadurai Sannadhi, Kumbakonam.
236	Shri Venkatesan R., F.C.A.	Barrow House, 12, Mc Lean St., Mad- ras-1.
237	Shri Visvanathan E. D., B.A., G.D.A., F.C.A.	16, Moore Street, Madras.
238	Shri Bodhankar V.M., F.C.A.	Kingsway, Nagpur.
239	Shri Chaluvaiya, B.Com., A.C.A.	68, II Cross Road, Cavipuram Extension, Bangalore-4.
240	Shri Dastgir Syed Ghulam, B.Com., F.C.A.	C/o S. G. Dastgir & Co., Hyderabad- Deccan.
241	Shri Iyengar M. K. Sampath, B.A., A.C.A.	1404, Sampige Rd., Malleswaram, Ban- galore.
242	Shri Iyer Nataraja, A.S.A., F.C.A.	C/o M/s. Nataraja Iyer & Co., Post Box No 157, Abid Road, Hyderabad-Deccan.
243	Shri Jagdeshan U. P., F.C.A.	Doitto.
244	Shri Mandre S.R., M.A., B.Com., F.C.A., F.S.A.A.	97, Gandhi Nagar, Bangalore-2.
245	Shri Raja Ram K., F.C.A.	97, Chiraghali Lane, Hyderabad.
246	Shri Rao P. Ramchandra, G.D.A., F.C.A.	Secunderabad.
247	Shri Rao P. Venkata, G.D.A., F.C.A.	C/o Rao & Co., Rajahmahendrapuram, Sitampet, Hyderabad.
248	Shri Shrikantiah H. V., B.A., LL.B., B.Com., F.C.A.	2647, Vani Vilas Mohalla, Mysore.
249	Shri Subramaniam T.M.S., A.C.A.	1/12, Bank of Mysore Building, Avenue Road, Bangalore-2.

III. JEWELLERS

1	Messrs. Ridkaran Kabra	18, Mullic Street, Calcutta.
2	Messrs. Sarramdas Dhalamal	Queens Mansion, 125, Park Street, Cal- cutta.
3	Messrs. Chimanlal Manchand	New Queens Road, Bombay.
4	Messrs. Hemchand Mohonlal & Co.	Dange Street, Bombay.
5	Messrs. Manilal Chimanlal & Co.	188, Shroff Bazar, Bombay-2.
6	Messrs. S. G. Zhaveri	134/36, Zaveri Bazar, Bombay.
7	Messrs. Muthusamy Chettiar	125, South Abavi, Movla St., Madurai.
8	Messrs. Kishenlal Chandra Kumar	Nagpur-2.

IV. WORKS OF ART.

1	Shti Gangoly, O. C.	2, Ashutosh Mukherjee Road, Calcutta-20.
2	Shri Chavda, Shivax	Ava Chambers, Behind Metro Cinema, Dhobi Talao, Bombay.
3	Shri Hebbbar, K. K.	81 A, Cadell Road, Bombay.
4	Shri Husain, M. F.	25-D, Badar Bagh, Balram Street, Bom- bay.
5	Shri Khandalwala Karl J.	8, Anstey Road, Cumballa Hill, Bombay- 26.
6	Shri Raval, R. M.	Chitrakoot, 44 Brahmin M. M. Society, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad.

Serial No.	Name	Address
7	Shri Rai Krishnadasa	Bharat Kala Bhavan, Banaras-5.
8	Shri Joshi, D. J.	Chitrakala Mandir, Indore.
9	Shri Vijaiverglya, Ram Gopal	Rajasthan Kala Sanstha, Jaipur.
10	Shri Govindraj, V. D.	23, Kalava Chetty Street, Chintadripet, Madras-2.
11	Shri Venkatachalam, G.	6, John's Road, Bangalore.

V.—Actuaries

1	Shri Datta, Hiralal, M.Sc., F.L., F.I.A. (Lond.)	28, Ganga Prasad Mukharjee Road, Calcutta-25.
2	Shri Gupta, Ajit Das, M.Sc., F.I.A. .	Suite 30, 30 Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16.
3	Shri Ghosh, Prabhat Kumar, M.Sc., F.I.A.	7, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta.
4	Shri Ghosh, Tejopaya, M.Sc., F.I.A. (Lond.)	Calcutta Insurance Ltd., 135, Canning Street, Calcutta-1.
5	Shri Sen, S. K., M.S., A.C.I.I., A.I.A., F.F.A.	15 Chittaranjan Avenue, (Top Floor), Calcutta.
6	Shri Pandit, K. A., B.Sc., F.I.A., (Lond.)	Churchgate House, 2nd Floor, Churchgate St., Fort, Bombay.
7	Shri Sapre, V. L., M.Sc., F.I.A. . . .	C/o British India General Insurance Co. Ltd. Mehta House, Apollo Street, Fort Bombay.
8	Shri Shrinivasan, T. R., M.A., F.I.A. (Lond.)	Bombay Mutual Building, Dr. Dadabhai Naoroji Road (Hornby Road), P. B. 645, Bombay-1.
9	Shri Venkatasubbiah, G., M.A. B.T., A.I.A. (Lond.)	Ganesh Dham, 780/4, Poona-4.
10	Shri Gupta, K. L., M.A., B.Sc., A.C.I.I., F.I.A., F.F.A.	Bharat Insurance Co., Ltd., 10, Daryaganj, Delhi.
11	Shri Subrahmaniam D., M.A., F.I.A., F.S.S., A.S.A.	General Manager, Andhra Insurance Co. Ltd., Masulipatam.
12	Shri Venkitasubramonia Iyer, R., B.A., F.I.A.	Addl. Finance Secretary, (Insurance) Govt. Sectt. Trivandrum.

[No. 15.]

R. K. DAS, Dy. Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2684.—The Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the list appended to the notification of the Government of India in the Finance Department (Revenue Division) No. 34, Income-tax, dated the 23rd November 1946, namely—

In the said list under the sub-head "Associations connected with Research work in Medicine" after entry 6 the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

7. The Universal Health Institute, Bombay.

[No. 48.]

G. L. POPHALE, Secy.

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY*New Delhi, the 11th August 1954*

S.R.O. 2685.—In pursuance of Rule 9 of the Development Council (Procedure) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. N. Gundu Rao, Chief Chemist and Factory Manager, Ravalgaon Sugar Farm Ltd., Ravalgaon (Distt. Nasik) as substitute to take the place of Shri R. C. Srivastava, Nawal Niwas, Kanpur, for the first meeting of the Development Council established under the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, S.R.O. No. 892, dated the 12th March 1954, for the Scheduled industry engaged in the manufacture and production of sugar.

[No. 5(7)IA(G)/54.]

B. B. SAKSENA, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2686.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 10 of the Indian Power Alcohol Act, 1948 (XXII of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the Indian Power Alcohol Rules, 1950, namely:—

In the said Rules—

(1) in clause (n) of rule 2, after the words “within the State”, the words “and include an excise sub-inspector in the State of Bombay” shall be inserted;

(2) in rule 30—

(a) in the opening paragraph, the words and figures “When 85 parts by volume of petrol are mixed with 15 parts by volume of power alcohol” shall be omitted;

(b) for clause (i), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

“(i) It must be perfectly homogenous and contain the prescribed proportion by volume of ethyl alcohol per 100 volumes of the mixture.”; and

(c) for clause (iv), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:—

“(iv) It must fulfil such additional tests to determine qualitatively the alcohol content as may, from time to time, be prescribed by the Power Alcohol Authority of the State.”;

(3) in paragraph 2 of Form P.A. 10, for the words “The addition of any substance to the mixture or any attempt to separate the constituents is strictly forbidden”, the words “The addition to the petrol—power alcohol mixture of any substance other than such substance as may be specifically approved by the Power Alcohol Authority of the State or any attempt to separate the constituents of such mixture is strictly forbidden.” shall be substituted.

[No. 42(7)/51-Ind(B).]

K. N. SHENOY, Under Secy.

TEA CONTROL*New Delhi, the 11th August 1954*

S.R.O. 2687.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Tea Act, 1953 (29 of 1953) the Central Government hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.R.O. 944, dated the 17th March 1954, namely:—

In the said notification—in the category of members representing persons employed on tea estates and gardens, for entry No. 24 the following entry shall be substituted namely:—

“24. Shri Deoprasad Ghose, Secretary, Zilla Cha-Kaman Workers' Union, P.O. Malbazar, District Jalpaiguri, West Bengal.”

[No. 48(2)Plant/54.]

RUBBER CONTROL

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2688.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 25 of the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Act, 1947 (XXIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments to the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Rules, 1947, namely—

In the said Rules—

(1) for rule 18, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

“18. The working year of the Board shall be the financial year commencing on the 1st day of April and ending with the 31st day of March next following. The Board shall in each year prepare an estimate of receipts and expenditure for the ensuing financial year and shall submit it for the sanction of the Central Government on or before such date as may be appointed by it in this behalf.”

(2) Rule 19 shall be omitted.

(3) In sub-rule (1) of rule 26, for the words ‘calendar year’, the words ‘financial year’ shall be substituted.

[No. 21(1)-Plant/54.]

R. N. KAPUR, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

ORDER

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2689.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 117 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of sub-rule (1) (i) of rule 104 in Chapter X of the said Rules shall be relaxed in the case of the use of the Ruston-Bucyrus, 3300 volts, three-phase, A.C. electrically driven excavating shovel in the South-Tirodi Manganese Mine of Messrs. Central Provinces Manganese Ore Company Ltd., Nagpur, to the extent that the high pressure parts of the driving motor of the said excavating machine may not be stationary while the machine is moving from one place to another and subject to the following conditions namely:—

- (a) the machine shall be worked with due care so as to avert danger arising out of any electrical defect and the insulation resistance of the high pressure circuit including the machine driving motor shall not be less than 10 megohms, and
- (b) the flexible trailing cable for use with the machine shall be of adequate size and of the type 321C under B.S.S. 1116 of 1943 and be connected to the electrical system and the machine by properly constructed connector box. The flexible cable shall be adequately protected from mechanical damage and shall be examined by competent person at least in each shift and replaced or properly repaired as soon as found damaged or defective.

Provided that the aforesaid relaxation shall be valid only for such time as the said machine is in use at the mine and that due information shall be given to the Central Government through the Electric Inspector of Mines as soon as that machine is taken out of the mine.

[No. EL.II.204(3).]

R. R. BAHL, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

PORTS

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2690.—In pursuance of sub-section (3) of section 6 of the Bombay Port Trust Act, 1879 (Bombay Act VI of 1879) the Central Government hereby publishes the following return received from the Secretary, The Millowners' Association namely:—

Return showing the name of the person elected by the Millowners' Association, Bombay, in accordance with the provisions of section 13(1) of the Bombay Port Trust Act, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Port of Bombay in the temporary absence on leave out of India of Shri Krishnaraj M.D. Thackersey.

Date of election.	Name of the person elected.
23rd July 1954	Shri Vithal N. Chandavarkar

[No. 8-PI(184)/54.]

New Delhi, the 16th August 1954

S.R.O. 2691.—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of Section 6 of the Calcutta Port Act, 1890 (Bengal Act III of 1890), it is hereby notified that in accordance with the provisions of Section 15 of the said Act Shri K. L. Jatia of Messrs. Onkarmull Kanailall & Co., Calcutta, has been elected by the Indian Chamber of Commerce to be a Commission for the Port of Calcutta with effect from the 24th July, 1954, vice Shri N. L. Kanoria on leave.

[No. 9-PI(144)/54.]

K. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.

MERCHANT SHIPPING

New Delhi, the 9th August 1954

S.R.O. 2692.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 245G and sub-section (1) of section 245J of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 (XXI of 1923), and in supersession of the Indian Merchant Shipping (Safety Convention Certificates) Rules, 1934, the Central Government hereby makes the following Rules, the same having been previously published as required by sub-section (1) of section 245J of the said Act, namely :—

1. These Rules may be called the Indian Merchant Shipping (Safety Convention Certificates) Rules, 1954.

2. (1) Every Safety Certificate shall be in one of the forms set out in the First Schedule hereto, and every Qualified Safety Certificate shall be in one of these forms with such modifications as are necessary to show in what respects the steamer, in respect of which the certificate is issued, complies with the requirements of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, and of the Simla Rules, 1931, so far as those requirements apply there to.

(2) Every Safety Radio-telegraphy Certificate shall be in the form set out in the Second Schedule hereto.

(3) Every Safety Radio-telephony Certificate shall be in the form set out in the Third Schedule hereto.

(4) Every Safety Equipment Certificate shall be in the form set out in the Fourth Schedule hereto.

(5) Every Exemption Certificate shall be in the form set out in the Fifth Schedule hereto.

(6) The particulars inserted by hand or typescript or otherwise in the Certificates issued or in certified copies thereof shall be inserted in Roman characters and Arabic figures.

3. In any case in which a Safety Certificate is granted under Section 245C(I) of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923, in respect of a steamer to which a Certificate of Survey under Part III of that Act is to be issued the Central Government may direct that such a Certificate may be combined in one document with the said Safety Certificate.

4. (1) The following fees shall be charged for certificates granted under these Rules, namely :—

(i) For every Safety or Qualified Safety Certificate, Rs. 60.

(ii) For every Radio-telegraphy certificate, Rs. 60.

(iii) For every Radio-telephony certificate, Rs. 60.

(iv) For every Exemption certificate, Rs. 16.

(v) For every Safety Equipment Certificate :

(a) For ships not exceeding 1600 tons gross, Rs. 100.

(b) For ships exceeding 1600 tons gross but not exceeding 3000 tons gross, Rs. 125.

(c) For ships exceeding 3000 tons gross, Rs. 175.

(2) Holiday and overtime fees for Safety and Qualified Safety Certificates shall be charged in accordance with the scale prescribed for a Certificate of Survey granted under the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923.

(3) For the grant of a Safety Radio-telegraphy certificate, Safety Radio-telephony certificate, Safety Equipment certificate or Exemption Certificate holiday and overtime fees shall be charged at the following scales, namely :—

(i) In addition to the fees payable under sub-rule (1) of this Rule, there shall be payable along with an application for inspection a fee of Rs. 60 in respect of every inspection which is required by such application to be made on any of the following days, namely :—

(a) Sunday

(b) Bank Holiday (January 1st)

(c) Republic Day

(d) Holi

(e) Id-ul-Fitr

(f) Independence Day

(g) Dusehra

(h) Mahatma Gandhi's Birthday

(i) Diwali

(j) Christmas Day.

(ii) The charges of overtime fees in respect of inspections wholly or partly carried out between the hours of 5 P.M. and 7 A.M. shall be regulated as follows :—

(a) Where on the application of the owner or agent of the ship a Surveyor or a Radio Inspector is called upon to undertake a survey or inspection of a vessel after 5 P.M. and before 7 A.M. an additional fee of Rs. 50 shall be charged ;

(b) Where a Surveyor or Radio-Inspector is detained at the request of the owner or agent after 5 P.M. to complete a survey or inspection undertaken between the hours of 7 A.M. and 5 P.M. an additional fee of Rs. 25 if the Surveyor or Radio-Inspector is released from duty before 6 P.M. and of Rs. 50 if detained later than 6 P.M. shall be charged ;

(c) Where the owner or agent has asked for inspection between the hours of 7 A.M. and 5 P.M. but the official arrangements have not allowed of the work being done between those hours, no additional fee shall be chargeable ;

(d) Where a Surveyor or Radio-Inspector has been called upon as specified in clause (a) or detained as specified in clause (b), the owner or agent shall give information of the fact in writing to the Principal Officer of the port stating the hours during which the Surveyor or Radio-Inspector was in attendance.

5. A Safety Certificate, Safety Radio-telegraphy Certificate, Safety Radio-telephony Certificate, Safety Equipment Certificate or Exemption Certificate purporting to have been issued in accordance with the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948

In respect of a ship not registered in India shall be deemed to be a valid Safety Convention Certificate if it complies with such of the following requirements as are applicable in the circumstances:—

- (i) it must in all relevant respects correspond to the form "prescribed in Rule 2 of these Rules;
- (ii) it must purport to be issued under the authority of the Government of a country to which the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, applies;
- (iii) it must be by the terms thereof, applicable to the voyage in respect of which the clearance of the ship is demanded and to the trade in which the ship is for the time being engaged;
- (iv) it must show that it is in force and either that it was issued for a period not exceeding twelve months in the case of Safety or Qualified Safety Certificate, Radio-telegraphy Certificate, Radio-telephony Certificate and Exemption Certificate and twenty-four months in the case of Safety Equipment Certificate or that it has been extended beyond the original period of validity for a further period not exceeding five months by a duly authorised officer of the country to which the ship belongs for the purpose of allowing her to return to that country, or (if not so extended) by a period not exceeding one month by a duly authorised officer of the country to which the ship belongs for any other purpose; and
- (v) it must show either that it was issued by or under the authority of the Government of the country to which the ship belongs or that it was issued at the request of that Government.

FIRST SCHEDULE

INDIA

SAFETY CERTIFICATE

FOR ^{AN} _____ INTERNATIONAL VOYAGE
A SHORT



Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of the life at Sea, 1948.

Issued by the
Government of India

Name of Ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage	Particulars of voyage, if any sanctioned under Regulation 22(c) of Chapter III

THIS IS TO CERTIFY:—

I. That the above-mentioned ship has been duly surveyed in accordance with the provisions of the International Convention referred to above:—

II. That the survey showed that the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulations annexed to the said Convention as regards:—

- (1) the structure, main and auxiliary boilers and machinery;
- (2) the watertight sub-division arrangements and details;
- (3) the following sub-division loadlines:—

Sub-division loadlines assigned and marked on the ship's side at amidships (Regulation 10 of Chapter II)	Freeboard	To apply when the spaces in which passengers are carried include the following alternative spaces.
C. 1		
C. 2		
C. 3		

III. That the life-saving appliances provide for a total number of persons and no more, viz.:—

-Lifeboats (includingmotor lifeboats or mechanically propelled lifeboats) capable of accommodatingpersons, and.....motor lifeboats fitted with radiotelegraph installation and searchlight (included in the total lifeboats shown above), requiringcertificated lifeboatmen;
-liferrafts capable of accommodating.....persons;
-buoyant apparatus capable of supporting.....persons;
-lifebuoys;
-lifejackets.

IV. That the lifeboats were equipped in accordance with provisions of the Regulations.

V. That the ship was provided with a line-throwing appliance and lifeboat portable radio apparatus in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations.

VI. That the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulations as regards radiotelegraph installations, viz.:—

	Requirements of Regulations	Actual Provision
Hours of listening by operator		
Number of operators		
Whether auto-alarm fitted		
Whether main installation fitted		
Whether emergency installation fitted		
Whether main and emergency transmitters electrically separated or combined		
Whether direction finder fitted		
Number of passengers for which certificated.		

VII. That the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulations, as regards fire detecting and fire-extinguishing appliances and was provided with navigation lights and shapes and means of making sound signals and distress signals, in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations and also the International Collision Regulations.

VIII. That in all other respects the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulation far as these requirements apply thereto.

The Certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain in force, unless previously cancelled, until the.....day of.....19.....

Issued at..... this..... day of.....19.....

The undersigned declares that he is duly authorised by the said Government to issue this Certificate.



SAFETY CERTIFICATE

INDIA

AN
For INTERNATIONAL VOYAGE IN THE COURSE OF WHICH UNBERTHED
A SHORT PASSENGERS ARE CARRIED.

Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of life at Sea 1948, and the Simla Rules, 1931.

Issued by the
Government of India

Name of Ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage	Particulars of voyages, if any, sanctioned under Regulation 22 (c) of Chapter III

THIS IS TO CERTIFY :—

I. That the above-mentioned ship has been duly surveyed in accordance with the provisions of the International Convention referred to above.

II. That the survey showed that the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulations annexed to the said Convention as regards :—

- (1) the structure, main and auxiliary boilers and machinery;
- (2) the radiotelegraph installations, viz.—

	Requirements of Regulations	Actual provision
Hours of listening by operator		
Number of operators		
Whether fitted with auto-alarm		
Whether main installation fitted		
Whether emergency installation fitted		
Whether main and emergency transmitters electrically separated or combined		
Whether direction finder fitted		
Number of passengers for which certificated.		

*III. That the survey showed that the ship, when carrying berthed passengers only and having on board a total number (crew and passengers) not exceeding..... persons, complied with the requirements of the Regulations annexed to the said Convention as regards :—

- (1) the watertight sub-division arrangements and details;
- (2) the following sub-division loadlines :—

Sub-division loadlines assigned and marked on the ship's side at amidships (Regulation 10 of Chapter II).	Freeboard	To apply when the spaces in which passengers are carried include the following alternative spaces
C. 1.		
C. 2.		
C. 3.		

*If not applicable, the words "Not applicable" should be written across this PART.

- (3) the life-saving appliances which provide for a total number ofpersons and no more, *viz* :—
-lifeboats (including.....motor lifeboats or mechanically propelled lifeboats) capable of accommodating.....persons, and.....motor lifeboats fitted with radio-telegraph installation and searchlight and (included in the total lifeboats shown above), requiring.....certificated lifeboatmen;
 -liferafts capable of accommodating.....persons;
 -buoyant apparatus capable of supporting..... persons;
 -lifebuoys;
 -lifejackets;
- (4) the lifeboats which are equipped in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations;
- (5) the line-throwing appliance and lifeboat portable radio apparatus.

THIS IS ALSO TO CERTIFY —

IV. That the above-mentioned ship has been duly surveyed in accordance with the provisions of the Simla Rules, 1931, applicable to a voyage within the following limits, *viz*.....

V. That the survey showed that the ship, when carrying unberthed passengers and having on board a total number (crew and passengers) not exceedingpersons, complied with the requirements of the said Simla Rules as regards :—

- (1) the watertight sub-division arrangements and details ;
- (2) The following sub-division loadlines :—

Sub-division loadlines assigned and marked on the ships side at amidships [Simla Rule 8 (4)]	Freeboard	To apply when the spaces in which passengers are carried include the following alternative spaces
D. 1.		
D. 2.		
D. 3.		

- (3) the life-saving appliances which provide for a total number of.....persons and no more, *viz*.—
-lifeboats (including.....motor lifeboats or mechanically propelled lifeboats) capable of accommodating.....persons, and.....motor life boat fitted with radio-telegraph installation and searchlight (included in the total lifeboats shown above), requiring.....certificated lifeboatmen;
 -liferafts capable of accommodating.....persons;
 -buoyant apparatus capable of supporting.....persons;
 -lifebuoys;
 -lifejackets;
- (4) the lifeboats which are equipped in accordance with the provisions of the regulations;
- (5) the life-throwing appliance and lifeboat portable radio apparatus.

VI. That the above-mentioned ship is, therefore, under the authority of Regulation 1 (e) Chapter II and Regulation 3 (b) Chapter III of the said convention, exempted from the requirements of Chapters II and III of the convention when carrying unberthed passengers within the limits specified in Part IV above.

VII. That in all other respects the ship complies with the requirements of the said Convention and Rules, so far as those requirements apply thereto.

This Safety Certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain in force, unless previously cancelled, until the.....day of.....19.....

Issued at.....the.....day of.....19....

The undersigned declares that he is duly authorised by the said Government to issue this certificate.

(Signature)

INDIA



SECOND SCHEDULE

SAFETY RADIO-TELEGRAPHY CERTIFICATE

Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of life at Sea, 1948.

Issued by the
Government of India

Name of ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage

THIS IS TO CERTIFY —

That the above-mentioned ship complies with the provisions of the Regulations annexed to the Convention referred to above as regards Radio-telegraphy .—

	Requirements of Regulations	Actual provision
Hours of listening by operator		
Number of operators		
Whether auto-alarm fitted		
Whether main installation fitted		
Whether emergency installation fitted . .		
Whether main and emergency transmitters electrically separated or combined		
Whether direction finder fitted		

This certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain in force, unless previously cancelled, until the..... day of.....19.....

Issued at.....this.....day of.....19....

The undersigned declares that he is dully authorised by the said Government to issue this Certificate.

.....
(Signature)



THIRD SCHEDULE

INDIA.

SAFETY RADIO-TELEPHONY CERTIFICATE

*Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of
life at Sea, 1948.*

Issued by the
Government of India

Name of Ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the above-mentioned ship complies with the provisions of the Regulations annexed to the Convention referred to above as regards Radio-telephony :—

	Requirements of Regulations	Actual provision
Hours of listening by operator		
Number of operators		

This certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain in force, unless previously cancelled, until the.....day of.....19....
Issued at.....the.....day of.....19....

The undersigned declares that he is duly authorised by the said Government to issue this Certificate.

(Signature).....

Port 181.



FOURTH SCHEDULE

INDIA

SAFETY EQUIPMENT CERTIFICATE

Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of life at Sea, 1948.

Issued by the
Government of India

Name of Ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage

THIS IS TO CERTIFY —

I. That the above-mentioned ship has been duly inspected in accordance with the provisions of the Convention referred to above.

II. That the inspection showed that the life-saving appliances provide for a total number of..... persons and no more, viz. :—

.....lifeboats on port side capable of accommodating..... persons.

.....lifeboats on starboard side capable of accommodating..... persons.

.....motor lifeboats and/or mechanically propelled lifeboats (included in the total lifeboats shown above).

.....lifebuoys.

.....lifejackets.

III. That the lifeboats were equipped in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations annexed to the Convention.

IV. That the ship was provided with a line-throwing apparatus and lifeboat portable radio apparatus in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations.

V. That the inspection showed that the ship complied with the requirements of the said Convention as regards fire-extinguishing appliances and was provided with navigation lights and shapes and means of making sound signals and distress signals in accordance with the provisions of the Regulations and the International Collision Regulations.

VI. That in all other respects the ship complied with the requirements of the Regulations so far as these requirements apply thereto.

This certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain in force, unless previously cancelled, until the.....day of.....19

Issued atthe.....day of..... 19

The undersigned declares that he is duly authorised by the Government to issue this Certificate.

(Signature).....

FIFTH SCHEDULE

INDIA



EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE

Issued under the provisions of the International Convention for the safety of life at Sea, 1948.

Issued by the
Government of India.

Name of Ship	Official Number	Port of Registry	Gross Tonnage

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the above-mentioned ship is under the authority conferred by Regulation.....of Chapter.....of the Regulation annexed to the International Convention referred to above, exempted from the requirements of *.....of the Convention on the voyagesto

Insert here the conditions
if any, on which the exemption
certificate is granted. }

This certificate is issued under the authority of the Government of India. It will remain, in force, unless previously cancelled, untill the.....day of.....19..-

Issued atthe.....day of.....19..-

The undersigned declares that he is duly authorised by the said Government to issue this Certificate.

(Signature.).....

*Insert here references to Chapters and Regulations specifying particular paragraphs.

[No. 46 MA(2)/54.]

New Delhi, the 21st August 1954

S.R.O. 2693.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 26A of the Indian Merchant Shipping Act, 1923 (XXI of 1923), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the Indian Merchant Shipping (Medical Examination) Rules, 1951, namely:—

In rule 14-A of the said Rules, for the figures, letters and words "1st September, 1954" the figures, letters and words "1st September, 1955" shall be substituted.

[No. 3-MS(12)/54.]

S. K. GHOSH, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2694.—Dr. Chunibhai S. Patel, M.B., B.S., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.R.C.S., 3, New Queens Road, Bombay, has been re-elected by the Senate of the Bombay University, as a member of the Dental Council of India under clause (d) of section 3 of the Dentists Act, 1948 (XVI of 1948), with effect from the 14th July, 1954.

[No. F.6-13/54-Med.]

BABU RAM, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING AND SUPPLY

New Delhi, the 16th August 1954

S.R.O. 2695.—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Government Premises (Eviction) Act, 1950 (XXII of 1950) and in supersession of the Notification No. 969-WII/52, dated 31st January 1952, the Central Government hereby authorises the Chairman, Delhi Improvement Trust, Delhi, to perform the functions of a Competent Authority under the said Act in respect of all lands belonging to the Improvement Trust Delhi; and in respect of all Nazul lands and premises vesting in the Trust for purposes of management.

[No. WII-70(1)/54.]

K. K. SHARMA, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

New Delhi, the 28th July 1954

S.R.O. 2696.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 57 of the Displaced Persons (Debts Adjustment) Act, 1951 (LXX of 1951), the Central Government hereby directs that the following amendments shall be made in the Insurance Claims Board Rules, 1952, published with the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Rehabilitation, No. S.R.O. 2000, dated the 27th November 1952, namely:—

In the said Rules—

(1) for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"7. In the event of any difference of opinion among the members of the Board with respect to any proposal to be made to the Tribunal, the opinion of the majority of the members present shall prevail, and if the opinion of the members present is evenly divided, the opinion of the Chairman shall prevail", and

(2) for rule 9, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"9(1) No act or proceeding of the Board shall be invalid or called in question on the ground merely—

(a) of the absence of the Chairman of any other member of the Board, or

- (b) of the existence of any vacancy in the membership of the Board, or of any change having occurred, or of any defect, in the constitution of the Board;

Provided that no business shall be transacted at any meeting of the Board, unless a quorum of at least one-half of the total number of members including the Chairman is present throughout the meeting.

- (2) When the Chairman or any other member rejoins his office after absence, proceeding may be continued before the Board from the stage at which he so rejoins".

[No. 54(12)/54-Prop.I.]

K. J. GEORGE, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 12th August 1954

S.R.O. 2697.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Claims) Supplementary Act, 1954 (No. 12 of 1954), the Central Government is pleased to appoint the following Settlement Officers to act as Additional Settlement Commissioners for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to them by or under the said Act, with effect from the forenoon of the 19th July, 1954:—

- (1) Shri R. C. Gulati.
- (2) Shri Bhagwandas Sugna Singh.
- (3) Shri Rupchand Assanmal.

[No. 2(25)/SB II/54.]

M. L. PURI, Under Secy.

REGISTRAR, JOINT STOCK COMPANIES

NOTICES

Madras, the 29th July 1954

NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 247(3)

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 and in the matter of Supplies (Madras) Limited.

S.R.O. 2698.—Whereas communications addressed to the Supplies (Madras) Ltd., at its registered office either remained unanswered or are returned undelivered through the Dead Letter Office.

And whereas it appears accordingly that the Supplies (Madras) Ltd. is not carrying on business or is not in operation.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 247(3) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 that unless cause is shown to the contrary before the expiration of three months from the date of this notice the name of the said company will be struck off the register and the said company will be dissolved.

NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 247(3)

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 and the Gokulnath Agricultural Products Limited.

S.R.O. 2699.—Whereas communications addressed to the Gokulnath Agricultural Products Limited at its registered office either remained unanswered or are returned undelivered by Post Office.

And whereas it appears accordingly that the Gokulnath Agricultural Products Limited is not carrying on business or is not in operation.

Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 247(3) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 that unless cause is shown to the contrary before the expiration of three months from the date of this notice the name of the said company will be struck off the register and the said company will be dissolved.

A. R. ARUMUGA MUDALIAR,
Asstt. Registrar, Joint Stock Companies, Madras.

Masulipatnam, the 31st July 1954

NOTICE PURSUANT TO SECTION 247(3)

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 and The Straw Board Mills, Ltd.

S.R.O. 2700.—Whereas communications addressed to the company at its registered office remained unanswered,

Notice is hereby given pursuant to section 247(3) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 that unless cause is shown to contrary before the expiration of three months from the date of this notice the name of the company will be struck off the registers and the company will be dissolved.

G. N. REDDY,
Asstt. Registrar, Joint Stock Companies, Masulipatnam.

Bombay, the 5th August 1954

S.R.O. 2701.—Notice is hereby given pursuant to Sub-section (5) of the Section 247 of the Indian Companies Act VII of 1913 that the name of the Union Garage Limited has this day been struck off the register and the said company is hereby dissolved.

[No. 6159]

Bombay, the 9th August 1954

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act VII of 1913 and Pravin and Company Limited.

S.R.O. 2702.—Notice is hereby given that by an order of the High Court of Judicature at Bombay, dated 30th July 1954, the name of the Pravin & Company Limited was restored to the Registrar of Companies and pursuant to section 247(6) of the Indian Companies Act 1913 the said Pravin & Company Limited is to be deemed to have continued in existence as if its name had not been struck off.

[No. 1938.]

T. J. GONDHALEKAR,
Registrar of Companies, Bombay.

Shillong, the 5th August 1954

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 (VII of 1913) and in the matter of Onkar Cotton and Oil Mills Ltd. of Dhubri, Assam.

S.R.O. 2703.—Notice is hereby given that the name of the Onkar cotton and Oil Mills Ltd. of Dhubri, Assam, has this day been struck off the Register and that the company is dissolved.

(Sd.) N. N. CHAKRAVARTY,
Registrar of Companies, Assam.

Sambalpur, the 8th August 1954

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 (VII of 1913), and the Sunrise Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works Limited.

S.R.O. 2704.—Notices pursuant to section 247(1), (2) and (3) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913, having been given to the above company to its registered office at Town Hall Road, Samil Manik Ghose Bazar, Cuttack and received back undelivered, it appears that it is neither carrying on business nor is in operation. The Sunrise Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. is struck off under section 247(5) of the said Act under orders of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, Orissa, dated the 30th July 1954.

[No. 884/JSC.127/54.]

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 (VII of 1913), and the Utkal Chemical Industries Limited.

S.R.O. 2705.—Notices in pursuance of section 247(1), (2) and (3) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913, having been given to the above company to its registered office at Chandinichauk, Cuttack-2 and received back undelivered, it appears, that it is neither, carrying on business nor is in operation. The Utkal Chemical Industries Ltd. is struck off under section 247(5) of the said Act under orders of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, Orissa, dated the 30th July 1954.

[No. 886/JSC.39/54.]

Sambalpur, the 13th August 1954

In the matter of Indian Companies Act, 1913 and the Kalahandi Development Syndicate Limited

S.R.O. 2706.—Whereas the notices under section 247 (1) and (2) of the Indian Companies Act, 1913, sent to the Registered Office of the Company P. O. Bhawani-patna, District Kalahandi remained unanswered, it appears that the company is neither carrying any business nor is in operation.

The notice in pursuance of sub-section 3 of section 247 of the Indian Companies Act, 1913 is therefore given that the name of the company will be struck off the register after three months from the date of issue of this notice unless cause is shown to the contrary.

[No. 926-JSC.-179/54.]

S. N. MISRA, Asstt. Registrar,
Joint Stock Companies, Orissa, Sambalpur.

Patna, the 11th August 1954

In the matter of the Indian Companies Act VII of 1913 and Bedi Cottage Industries Ltd.

S.R.O. 2707.—Whereas the Bedi Cottage Industries Ltd., Patna City, was duly served with a notice dated the 9th April, 1954 under section 247(3) of the Indian Companies Act, but has for a period of three months failed to show cause why its name should not be struck off the register kept in this office. I do hereby give notice under section 247(5) of the Act that the name of the company has this day been struck off the register and the company is dissolved.

S. P. SINHA, Registrar.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

New Delhi, the 9th August 1954

S.R.O. 2708.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Jagat Roy and two others, workmen of the North Akaskinaree Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 328 of 1953

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

(1) Shri Jagat Roy, 2. Shri Kedar Roy and 3. Shri Bisun Turi—All workmen of North Akaskinaree Colliery, C/o Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Opposite Imperial Bank, Dhanbad—*Complainants.*

Vs.

Management of North Akaskinaree Colliery, of M/s Khimji Dossa & Co., P.O. Katrasgarh, Distt. Manbhum, Bihar—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES

Shri Kanti Mehta, Genl. Secretary, Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Opposite Imperial Bank of India, Dhanbad—*For the complainants.*

Shri B. B. Banerjee, Manager, North Akaskinaree Colliery, P.O. Katrasgarh, Distt. Manbhum, Bihar—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainants alleged that during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952, the opposite party altered the conditions of service of the complainants to their prejudice. The complainants Nos. 1 and 2 had been working regularly as bailing coolies who were arbitrarily dismissed without notice, in the first half of June 1953. Complainant No. 3 was a miner and he was arbitrarily discharged in the second half of June without notice. In effecting these dismissals, the opposite party acted *mala fide* and was influenced by extraneous considerations. The complainants therefore prayed that they should be reinstated in their original posts and paid wages for the period of involuntary idleness.

3. The opposite party urged that the complainants 1 and 2 were engaged from October 1952 as bailing coolies. They never attended their duties regularly. They absented from work at the time of seed sowing and paddy cutting. The opposite party did not relieve them from work but they left the work of their own accord to do their agricultural work. Hence they were not entitled to be reinstated or to get any wages. Complainant No. 3 was a non-resident worker and used to come to the colliery to work in his spare time. He was a seasonal worker and when rainy season drew near, he absented himself from work to look after the fields. He was also not relieved by the management. He was therefore also not entitled to reinstatement or to any relief.

4. When the matter came up for hearing on 21st June, 1954, the complainant No. 3 filed an application Exhibit 16 stating that he did not want to proceed with this complaint, as he was doing agricultural work. This application was also signed by Shri Das Gupta who represents him. The complainant No. 3 was present and on being questioned, he stated that he did not want to wish to proceed with his complaint. In the result, the complaint of complainant No. 3 Bisun Turi does not survive and it is dismissed.

5. The complaint thus survives only for the other two complainants, viz., Jagat Roy and Kedar Roy. These two persons were working as bailing coolies in the colliery of the opposite party. They alleged that they were working there for about two years and were arbitrarily dismissed in about June 1953. On the other hand, the opposite party urged that these two persons were working as bailing coolies since October 1952 and voluntarily left work in June 1953 and were not dismissed by the opposite party. It was urged that these people left the colliery in June because they wanted to do their agricultural work. The opposite party also relied on an application Exhibit 9 bearing thumb mark of Complainant No. 1 (Jagat Roy) in which he stated that he did not want to proceed with this complaint. On the other hand, the complainant Jagat Roy says that he was made to put his thumb mark on this application under a mis-representation that he would be given his job and would also be paid Rs. 10.

6. Taking the application Exhibit 9 first, it may be noted that the complainant Jagat Roy is an illiterate person. It is easy to persuade an illiterate workman who may be in need to put his thumb mark on any document and unless it is shown that the workman knew and understood the nature of the writing on which he was putting his thumb mark, that writing could not be taken as sufficient proof that he did not want to proceed with this complaint. The complainant Jagat Roy was examined at Exhibit 19 and he has said that he was told that he would be given work and would be paid Rs. 10 if he put his thumb mark on the above paper and thereupon he did so. He further says that neither work was given to him nor was he paid anything. On the other hand, the opposite party examined one Lalji at Exhibit 22, who is working as Surface incharge at the colliery. He said that he was present when Jagat Roy put his thumb mark on this writing; that Jagat Roy had come to the office with Durga Roy and requested that he should be paid some money by way of Bakshis (*ex gratia* payment) and if that was done, he would withdraw the complaint. He further said that an amount of Rs. 20 was paid to Jagat Roy and a writing taken from him and this writing was written by some clerk and it was read over to Jagat Roy and he admitted it and put his thumb mark on it. The person who wrote the above writing has not been examined as a witness. Lalji is an employee of the management and is not a disinterested witness. There is nothing tangible to show that he was really present when this writing was passed. It is easy for any one to come forward to say that he was present when a particular writing was passed. If the said writing was

written by him or had been attested by him, then there could have been no doubt about his presence. As it is, I am not prepared to believe that Lalji was present when this writing was passed.

7. As I said above, the person who wrote the writing has not been examined. Further, the writing does not mention as to what amount was paid to Jagat Roy. If Jagat Roy was paid Rs. 20 as alleged by Lalji, there is no reason why that amount was not specifically mentioned in this writing. Lalji admits that no separate receipt was taken from the complainant to show that he was paid Rs. 20. He says that there is no such practice of taking receipts when any payment is made *ex gratia*. In my opinion, when a payment was made whether *ex gratia* or otherwise, during the pendency of a complaint before the Tribunal, and if that was a consideration for withdrawing the complaint, I am sure that a separate receipt for the money paid to the complainant would have been taken from him. At any rate, the amount must have been debited in the account books of the colliery; but no account books have been produced in support of the allegation that the amount was paid to the complainant. I am thus not satisfied that the complainant Jagat Roy was paid Rs. 20 as alleged by the opposite party. Further even if he was paid some amount, I am not satisfied that he agreed to withdraw the present complaint. It is easy for an employer to persuade an illiterate workman to put his thumb mark on a writing by paying him some amount but that would not mean that the workman relinquished all his claims and especially a claim of reinstatement against the opposite party. I, therefore, held that the complainant cannot be dismissed on the strength of the writing Exhibit 9.

8. Coming to the merits of the case, the complainants' case is that they were dismissed in June 1953, while the management urge that they left the work of their own accord, because they wanted to go to do agricultural work. If a person wants to do agricultural work, he would not leave in June but would do so earlier. The rains usually start in June; some preliminary work has to be done before the rains set in. A person would be late for agriculture if he started his work after the commencement of rains. Thus the fact that the complainants left in June would show that the allegations that they left voluntarily to agricultural work cannot be believed.

9. The complainants were working as bailing coolies and as such they had to pump out water from the working places. I was told by the manager that this work is only temporary work, that is, bailing coolies are engaged when there is water in the mine and they are discontinued when there is no water in the mine. In my opinion, the present complainants must have been discharged by the opposite party when there was no water in the mine; because by about May or June, the mines become dry and no bailing coolies are required at that time. Sometime after the rainy season starts, water again begins to accumulate in the mine. This would be in September or October and at that time bailing coolies would again be engaged.

10. The opposite party has examined one Moti Roy, a Mining Sardar, at Exhibit 21. He has said that he had recruited Jagat Roy as a bailing coolie on the specific understanding that he would be given work only as long as there was water in the mine; that is to say, he would be discontinued when there was no water in the mine. At this stage, I may also mention that Mr. Banerjee for the opposite party argued that the complainants had been engaged on a temporary basis, that is, on the basis that they would be given work only as long as there was water in the mine and when there was no water, they would be automatically discharged. I may point out that this was not pleaded in the written statement of the opposite party. As a matter of fact, this plea is somewhat inconsistent with the plea raised in the written statement to the effect that the complainants left the colliery of their own accord to look after their agricultural work. To say that these people were engaged for a temporary period as long as there was water in the mine and were automatically discharged when there was no water in the mine, is different from saying that these persons left voluntarily because they wanted to go to do agricultural work. In view of the fact that there was no allegation made in the written statement that the complainants were engaged on a temporary basis nor that it was a condition of service that they would be discharged when there was no water in the mine, this plea of the opposite party raised at the time of hearing cannot be allowed.

11. I may then mention that in his evidence, the Mining Sardar Moti Roy (Exhibit 21), who, as I said above, has been examined as a witness on behalf of the opposite party, has admitted that as there was no water in the mine, the manager told the complainants that there was no work for them and that they

would be called later on, if and when there was water in the mine. This specific admission of the opposite party's own witness specifically disproves the allegation of the management that the complainants left their job of their own accord to do their agricultural work, and proves the complainants' case that they were discharged by the opposite party.

12. In this connection, I may also refer to the wage registers of the opposite party. They show that in the week ending 18th June 1953, not only the complainants, but there were three other persons, working as bailing coolies. All these five persons were shown in the registers as bailing coolies even in the preceding weeks. But from the week after 18th June 1953, not a single workman was shown as working as a bailing coolie. This clearly shows that the management had no work of bailing coolies after 18th June 1953 and that is why they must have discharged the complainants and also the other bailing coolies. It must have been a case of discharge by the management and not a case of workman voluntarily leaving the work.

13. It was alleged that the complainants were discharged because they had joined a particular union. It does appear that there are two rival unions functioning in this colliery. The management have recognised one of them. There is however no evidence to show that the complainants were members of a particular union nor is there any evidence to show that they were threatened by the management because of the same. I therefore do not believe the complainants' allegation that they were discharged because of their being members of a particular union.

14. The complainants have alleged that they were working in the colliery for about two years while the management have alleged that the complainants were working only for about eight months. Even according to the evidence of the opposite party's own witness Moti Roy, the complainants worked there for more than one year. Admittedly the complainants were recruited in about October and according to the evidence of Moti Roy, they worked for more than a year and this would show that the complainants must have been recruited, if not in October 1950, at least in October 1951.

15. It was urged that the complainants were not working regularly for all days in all weeks. On the other hand, the complainants alleged that the management did not allow them to work all the days in the week. The opposite party's witness Lalji says that he could show from the books of 1954 that work was going on for all six days in the week in the colliery. When questioned about 1952-53, he conveniently said that he did not know whether work was going on all the six days in the week in those years. Lalji is concerned with surface work and could not say anything about the underground working. I hold that the complainants were not able to work for all six days in a week, because the management did not allow them to do so.

16. On the whole, I am satisfied that this is a case of discharge by the management and not a case of the complainants voluntarily leaving the work. The management were not justified in discharging the workmen during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without obtaining the permission of this Tribunal. If they had not sufficient work, they could have asked for permission to retrench the workmen. As it is, they did not do so.

17. In my opinion, the action of the management in discharging the complainants 1 and 2 was not justified. They are therefore entitled to be reinstated and also to payment of back wages for the period of their idleness. I direct that the complainants Jagat Roy and Kedar Roy should be reinstated within two weeks of this award becoming enforceable, on their offering themselves for employment. I further direct that these two complainants should be paid their wages and all other advantages as if they were on duty from the date of their discharge till the date of their reinstatement. This amount should be paid to them within one month of the award becoming enforceable. The complaint of Bisun Turi is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 29th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/I.]

S.R.O. 2709.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri G. L. Shrivastava, a workman of the Burhar Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 43. OF 1954.

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I. D. Act 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES:

Shri G. L. Shrivastava, Ex-Accountant and Head Clerk, Messrs. Rewa Coalfields Limited, Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The management of Messrs. Rewa Coalfields Ltd.'s, Burhar Colliery, P. O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES:

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the complainant.*

Shri S. S. Sharma, Auditor, Rewa Coalfield Limited's, Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*For the opposite party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as Accountant and Head Clerk in the Burhar Colliery of the opposite party. He further alleged that he was wrongfully suspended on 20th November, 1952 and dismissed on 21st November, 1952 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal. He therefore urged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and claimed that he should be reinstated with full wages and emoluments for the period of his enforced idleness.

3. The opposite party raised a preliminary objection that as the complaint was filed long after the conclusion of the proceedings on the main reference the complaint was not maintainable and the complainant was not entitled to any relief. In my opinion, the objection must be upheld.

4. As I said above, the complainant alleged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of Industrial Disputes Act by dismissing him during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 and thereby committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before a Tribunal without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33, the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made. But it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this Section must be made as far as possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Ltd. 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J., p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950, but that Section is similar to section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

5. Now, in the present case, the complainant was dismissed on 21st November, 1952. It is true that at that time Reference No. 6 of 1952 was pending and by dismissing the complainant without the permission of this Tribunal, the opposite party had committed a breach of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It may however be noted that the present complaint was filed on 5th April, 1954; that is, more than 16 months after his dismissal. It may also be noted that the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over long before this. My award in that reference has been published in the *Gazette of India* on 10th October, 1953 and hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that reference must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November, 1953. The present complaint is, as I said above, filed on 5th April, 1954. In other words, the complaint was filed about five months after the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over and more than 16 months after the dismissal of the complainant. The delay on the face of it is unreasonable.

6. Mr. Malviya on behalf of the complainant however urged that the complainant had not filed a complaint earlier because he had approached the Conciliation Officer and the matter was pending before him. I am very doubtful whether merely because a person has approached the Conciliation Officer, he should not have approached this Tribunal earlier. After all, the powers of the Conciliation Officer are recommendatory and he could not direct an employer to re-employ a dismissed employee. On the other hand, if a dismissal is found to be wrongful, the Tribunal could pass an award directing reinstatement. Hence it should be more in the fitness of things that an aggrieved person should have approached this Tribunal rather than the Conciliation Officer and merely because he had approached the Conciliation Officer, it could not be said that the delay in his approaching the Tribunal should be considered reasonable. It may also be noted that Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act gives a special right to a workman to approach the Tribunal directly with a complaint and the right must be exercised within a reasonable time.

7. Further, in this case, according to the complainant himself, as mentioned in Para. 6 of the complaint, it was not the complainant but their Union who had made an application to the Conciliation Officer. Further the Conciliation Officer is said to have paid a visit to the colliery in May 1953 and held conciliation proceedings. The complainant had admitted in the complaint that after this nothing happened in the matter. In other words, after May 1953, the complainant had no justification whatsoever for the delay in making a complaint to this Tribunal. As I said above, the complaint has been made in April 1954, that is, about 11 months after the conclusion of the conciliation proceedings. Hence even if the delay is due to the fact that the complainant has approached the Conciliation Officer, there has been a further unreasonable delay after the conclusion of the proceedings. In any case, therefore, I think that the present complaint has been filed after an unreasonable delay.

8. In the result, the complaint is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 28th July 1954.

L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/II.]

S.R.O. 2710.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Mohammad Khan and two others, workmen of the Burhar Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 46 OF 1954.

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application under Section 33A of I. D. Act 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.,—*Chairman*.

PARTIES:

- (1) Shri Mohammad Khan, Senior Accounts Clerk, 2. Shri Prabhakar Rao, No. 2 Incline Clerk, 3. Shri Jamuna Prasad, No. 3 Incline Clerk, employees of M/s. Rewa Coalfields Ltd's., Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainants*.

Vs.

The Management of M/s. Rewa Coalfields Ltd's., Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES:

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the complainants*.

Shri S. S. Sharma, Auditor, M/s Rewa Coalfield Ltd's., Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Distt. Shandol, Vindhya Pradesh—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainants alleged that they were working as Senior Accounts Clerk, No. 2 Incline Clerk, and No. 3 Incline Clerk, respectively in the Burhar Colliery of the opposite party. They further alleged that they were wrongfully suspended on 20th November, 1952 and dismissed on 21st November, 1952 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal. They therefore urged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and claimed that they should be reinstated with full wages and emoluments for the period of their entorced idleness.

3. The opposite party raised a preliminary objection that as the complaint was filed long after the conclusion of the proceedings of the main reference, the complaint was not maintainable and the complainants were not entitled to any relief. In my opinion, the objection must be upheld.

4. As I said above, the complainants alleged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by dismissing them during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 and thereby committed a breach of Section 33 of Industrial Disputes Act. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before a Tribunal without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33, the aggrieved employees may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made. But it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the Section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this Section must be made as far as possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Ltd., 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J. p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950; but that Section is similar to Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

5. Now, in the present case, the complainants were dismissed on 21st November, 1952. It is true that at that time Reference No. 6 of 1952 was pending and by dismissing the complainants without the permission of this Tribunal, the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It may however be noted that the present complaint was filed on 7th April, 1954, that is, more than 16 months after their dismissal. It may also be noted that the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over long before this. My award in that reference has been published in the *Gazette of India* on 10th October, 1953 and hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that reference must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953. The present complaint is, as I said above filed on 7th April, 1954. In other words, the complaint was filed about five months after the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over and more than 16 months after the dismissal of the complainants. The delay on the face of it is unreasonable.

6. Mr. Malviya on behalf of the complainants however urged that the complainants had not filed a complaint earlier because they had approached the Conciliation Officer and the matter was pending before him. I am very doubtful whether merely because a person has approached the Conciliation Officer, he should not have approached this Tribunal earlier. After all, the powers of the Conciliation Officer are recommendatory, and he could not direct an employer to re-employ a dismissed employee. On the other hand, if a dismissal is found to be wrongful, the Tribunal could pass an award directly reinstatement. Hence it should be more in the fitness of things that an aggrieved person should have approached this Tribunal rather than the Conciliation Officer and merely because he had approached the Conciliation Officer, it could not be said that the delay in his approaching the Tribunal should be considered reasonable. It may also be noted that Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act gives a special right to a workman to approach the Tribunal directly with a complaint and the right must be exercised within a reasonable time.

7. Further, in this case, according to the complainants themselves, as mentioned in para. 6 of the complaint, it was not the complainants but their union who had made an application to the Conciliation Officer. Further the Conciliation Officer is said to have paid a visit to the colliery in May 1953 and held conciliation proceedings. The complainants have admitted in the complaint that after this nothing happened in the matter. In other words, after May 1953, the complainants had no justification whatsoever for the delay in making a complaint to this Tribunal. As I said above, the complaint has been made in April 1954, that is, about 11 months after the conclusion of the conciliation proceedings. Hence even if the delay is due to the fact that the complainants had approached the Conciliation Officer, there has been a further unreasonable delay after the conclusion of the proceedings. In any case, therefore, I think that the present complaint has been filed after an unreasonable delay.

8. In the result, the complaint is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 28th July 1954

L. P. DAVE, Chairman,
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal,
Dhanbad.

[No. J.R.2(365)/III.]

S.R.O. 2711.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri S. K. Pathak and two others, workmen of the Burhar Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 45 of 1954

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application under Section 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES:

1. Shri S. K. Pathak, Office Clerk, 2. Shri Jagjiwanlal Shrivastava, Accounts Clerk, 3. Mr. Mohd Ishaque, Attendance Clerk, Employees of Messrs. Rewa Coalfields Ltd., Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Distt. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainants.*

Vs.

The Management of M/s. Rewa Coalfields Ltd's Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES:

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainants.*

Shri S. S. Sharma, Auditor, Rewa Coalfields Ltd's Burhar Colliery, P.O. Dhanpuri, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainants alleged that they were working as Office Clerk, Accounts Clerk, and Attendance Clerk, respectively in the Burhar colliery of the Opposite Party. They further alleged that they were wrongfully suspended on 20th November 1952 and dismissed on 21st November 1952 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal. They therefore urged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and claimed that they should be reinstated with full wages and emoluments for the period of their enforced idleness.

3. The opposite party raised a preliminary objection that as the complaint was filed long after the conclusion of the proceedings of the main reference, the complaint was not maintainable and the complainants were not entitled to any relief. In my opinion, the objection must be upheld.

4. As I said above, the complainants alleged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by dismissing them during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 and thereby committed a breach of Section 33 of Industrial Disputes Act. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before a Tribunal without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33, the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made. But it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this Section must be made as far as possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Ltd., 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J. p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950, but that section is similar to Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

5. Now, in the present case, the complainants were dismissed on 21st November 1952. It is true that at that time Reference No. 6 of 1952 was pending and by dismissing the complainants without the permission of this Tribunal, the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It may however be noted that the present complaint was filed on 7th April 1954, that is, more than 16 months after their dismissal. It may also be noted that the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over long before this. My award in that reference has been published in the *Gazette of India* on 10th October 1953 and hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that reference must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953. The present complaint is, as I said above, filed on 7th April 1954. In other words, the complaint was filed about five months after the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 was over and more than 16 months after the dismissal of the complainants. The delay on the face of it is unreasonable.

6. Mr. Malviya on behalf of the complainants however urged that the complainants had not filed a complaint earlier because they had approached the Conciliation Officer and the matter was pending before him. I am very doubtful whether merely because a person has approached the Conciliation Officer, he should not have approached this Tribunal earlier. After all, the powers of the Conciliation Officer are recommendatory, and he could not direct an employer to re-employ a dismissed employee. On the other hand, if a dismissal is found to be wrongful, the Tribunal could pass an award directing reinstatement. Hence it should be more in the fitness of things that an aggrieved person should have approached this Tribunal rather than the Conciliation Officer and merely because he had approached the Conciliation Officer, it could not be said that the delay in his approaching the Tribunal should be considered reasonable. It may also be noted that Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act gives a special right to a workman to approach the Tribunal directly with a complaint and the right must be exercised within a reasonable time.

7. Further, in this case, according to the complainants themselves, as mentioned in para. 6 of the complaint, it was not the complainants but their Union who had made an application to the Conciliation Officer. Further the Conciliation Officer

is said to have paid a visit to the colliery in May 1953 and held conciliation proceedings. The complainants have admitted in the complaint that after this nothing happened in the matter. In other words, after May 1953, the complainants had no justification whatsoever for the delay in making a complaint to this Tribunal. As I said above, the complaint has been made in April 1954, that is, about 11 months after the conclusion of the conciliation proceedings. Hence even if the delay is due to the fact that the complainants had approached the Conciliation Officer, there has been a further unreasonable delay after the conclusion of the proceedings. In any case, therefore, I think that the present complaint has been filed after an unreasonable delay.

8. In the result, the complaint is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 28th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman.*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/IV.]

S.R.O. 2712.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Bhagwatidin Koiri, a workman of the Loyabad Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 58 OF 1954

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.,—*Chairman.*

PARTIES:

Bhagwatidin Koiri, Trammer, 9 Pit, Loyabad Colliery, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*Complainant.*

Vs.

Messrs. Burrakur Coal Co. Ltd., Loyabad Colliery, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES:

Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary, Loyabad Labour Union, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*For the Complainant.*

Shri D. N. Gupta, Chief Personnel Officer, M/s. Bird & Co. Ltd., P.O. Sijua, Dist. Manbhum—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that in June 1953, he went home on leave and later on got his leave extended. He asked for further extension of leave. He got no reply to it. On return from leave, he approached the authorities, who did not permit him to resume duty. This refusal amounted to alteration in the conditions of his service and also to a contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, as this happened during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952. The complainant therefore filed the present complaint for proper orders.

3. At the hearing before me, a preliminary objection was raised by the opposite party that the complaint should be dismissed as it was filed after an unreasonable delay. In my opinion, this objection must be accepted.

4. As I said above, the complainant has filed the present complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act alleging that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before

a Tribunal or changing condition of his service without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33 of the Act, the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made; but it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this section must be made as far as possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Limited, 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J., p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950; but that section is similar to Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

5. The award in Reference No. 6 of 1952 was published in the *Gazette of India* dated 10th October 1953. Hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Act, the proceedings in that reference must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953.

6. The present complaint has been filed on 24th May 1954, i.e. more than six months after the conclusion of the above proceedings. The complainant was not allowed to work somewhere in July 1953 and that would mean that he filed the present complaint about ten months after the action of the management, which, according to him, amounted to a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. The delay in filing the complaint is unreasonable. No explanation is offered as to why the complaint was filed after such a long delay. In my opinion the complaint must be dismissed as having been filed after an unreasonable delay.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 29th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.
[No. LR.2(365)/V.]

S.R.O. 2713.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Laljit Ram, a workman of the Loyabad Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 56 OF 1954

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B., *Chairman*.

PARTIES:

Shri Laljit Ram, Prop Mistry, 3/16 Incline, Loyabad Colliery, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*Complainant*.

Vs.

Messrs. Burrakur Coal Co. Ltd., Loyabad Colliery, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES:

Shri Lalit Burman, General Secretary, Loyabad Labour Union, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Manbhum—*For the Complainants*.

Shri D. N. Gupta, Chief Personnel Officer, M/s. Bird & Co. Ltd., P.O. Sijua, Dist. Manbhum—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he went home on leave for seven days from 28th June 1953. While he was at home, he fell ill and requested for an extension of his leave by 14 days. When he returned and reported for duty, he was not allowed to join. He urged that the opposite party had thus contravened the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, by not allowing the complainant to work, during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952, without the express permission of the Tribunal. He therefore prayed for proper orders.

3. At the hearing before me, a preliminary objection was raised by the opposite party that the complaint should be dismissed as it was filed after an unreasonable delay. In my opinion, this objection must be upheld.

4. As I said above, the complainant has filed the present complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act, alleging that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before a Tribunal or from changing conditions of his service, without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33, the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made. But it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this Section must be made as far as possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Ltd., 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J., p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act, 1950; but that section is similar to section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

5. The award in Reference No. 6 of 1952 was published in the *Gazette of India* on 10th October 1953 and hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that case must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953.

6. The present complaint has been filed on 15th May 1954, i.e. more than six months after the conclusion of the above proceedings. The complainant is said to have been not allowed to work somewhere in July 1953 and that would mean that he filed the present complaint about 10 months after the action of the management, which, according to the complainant, amounted to a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. The delay in filing the complaint is unreasonable. No explanation is offered as to why the complaint was filed after such a long delay. In my opinion, the complaint must be dismissed, as having been filed after an unreasonable delay.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 29th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*.

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad:

[No. LR.2(365)/VI.]

S.R.O. 2714.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Hirnamus Bage, a workman of the West Bokaro Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 63 of 1954

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B., *Chairman.*

PARTIES:

Shri Hirnamus Bage, C/o Shri R. C. Roy, Secretary, West Bokaro Colliery Workers' Union, P.O. Ghatotand, Dist. Hazaribagh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The Deputy Agent, West Bokaro Colliery, P.O. Ghatotand, Dist. Hazaribagh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES:

No appearance on behalf of the complainant.
No notice issued to the Opposite party.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant filed this complaint, alleging that the opposite party has been guilty of contravention of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act as he dismissed the complainant on 26th May 1954 without obtaining the permission of this Tribunal.

3. In the complaint, the complainant stated that the complaint arose out of Reference No. 6 of 1952. The award in that reference was published in the *Gazette of India* on 10th October 1953; and hence under Section 20(3) read with section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that case must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953. That being so, on the date on which the complainant is said to have been dismissed (26th May 1954), Reference No. 6 of 1952 was not pending before the Tribunal.

4. Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act lays down *inter alia* that during the pendency of any proceedings before a Tribunal in respect of any industrial dispute, no employer should discharge or dismiss any workman concerned in such dispute, without the express permission in writing from the Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer contravenes the provisions of Section 33 during the pendency of proceedings before a Tribunal the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. In other words, both sections 33 and 33A require that the dismissal of the employee should be during the pendency of proceedings before a Tribunal.

5. In the present case, according to the complainant's own allegation, he was dismissed on 26th May 1954 when Reference No. 6 of 1952 was not pending before this Tribunal. The opposite party therefore could not be said to have contravened the provisions of Section 33 by dismissing him on that date nor could the complainant maintain a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

6. No other reference between the opposite party and their workmen was pending before this Tribunal on 26th May 1954. A notice was issued to the complainant to show how the complaint was maintainable when Reference No. 6 of 1952 or any other reference was not pending before this Tribunal on the date of his dismissal. He has not replied to the notice nor has he appeared to show how the complaint is maintainable.

7. The result is that the complaint is not maintainable and is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 29th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman.*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/VII.]

New Delhi, the 12th August 1954

S.R.O. 2715.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award

of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri K. J. Sakharker, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 36 OF 1954

(Arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B., *Chairman.*

PARTIES:

Shri K. J. Sakharker, Kotma Colliery of the Associated Cement Cos. Limited,
P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The Management of Kotma Colliery of the Associated Cement Cos. Limited,
P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES:

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainant.*

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personal Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by transferring him from the general shift to the rotation shift from 1st October 1953 and by calling for his explanations and issuing charge sheets and suspending and dismissing him during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 and Reference No. 1 of 1953 without the permission from this Tribunal. He therefore filed the present complaint for reinstatement and payment of full wages, compensation, etc.

3. The opposite party raised several contentions. One of them was that even on the facts stated in the complaint, the opposite party had not done any act during the pendency of any proceedings before the Tribunal and hence it had not committed any breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. Section 33 of the Act lays down that during the pendency of proceedings before a Tribunal, no employer shall alter to the prejudice of the workman concerned in such dispute, the conditions of service applicable to them or discharge or punish any workman without the express permission in writing from the Tribunal. Section 33A provides that where an employer contravenes the provisions of Section 33 of the Act during the pendency of proceedings before a Tribunal, an employee aggrieved by such contravention, may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. In other words, Section 33A empowers a workman to approach the Tribunal only in respect of acts done by the employer during the pendency of proceedings before it.

5. The opposite party and its workmen were not parties to Reference No. 1 of 1953. Shri Malviya admitted this on behalf of the complainant and stated that Reference No. 1 of 1953 was mentioned in the complaint through a mistake. Reference No. 6 of 1952 was a reference between several collieries including the opposite party and their workmen. My award in that case was published in the *Gazette of India*, dated 10th October 1953. Hence under Section 20(3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that case came to an end from 10th November 1953.

6. According to the allegations made in the complaint itself, the complainant was suspended on 27th November 1953 and dismissed on 6th December 1953. Both these acts were committed after the pendency of the above proceedings was over, and they cannot give any cause of action to the complainant to make a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, nor can the Tribunal have jurisdiction to go into the question about the correctness or otherwise of this suspension and dismissal.

7. It is true that the complainant has alleged that between 1st October 1953 and 30th October 1953, his explanation had been asked for and charge-sheets were

issued against him. Asking for an explanation or issuing of a charge-sheet would not constitute an alteration in the conditions of service and would not give jurisdiction to the Tribunal to entertain a complaint regarding the same.

8. The complainant has also alleged that from 1st October 1953 he was transferred from the general shift where he was working directly under the General Manager to the rotation shift under the Head Overman and that this amounted to alteration in the conditions of service to his prejudice. I do not feel that this change can be said to be a change prejudicial to the workman. Transferring from one shift to another is an inherent right of the employer. Similarly the fact that the complainant was placed under an Head Overman instead of being directly under the General Manager would not by itself amount to an alteration in the conditions of service prejudicial to the workman. I may state here that there is no allegation that any other condition of service has been altered to the complainant's prejudice.

9. I may also mention that even if the change from one shift to another amounted to an alteration prejudicial to the workman, no relief could be given to him in this complaint, because of his subsequent dismissal, as the question of dismissal cannot be gone into by this Tribunal in these proceedings.

10. Thus *prima facie* the complaint, as it stands, would not be maintainable under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act, because there does not appear to have been any breach of Section 33 of the Act when these points were discussed at the hearing, the complainant requested that he should be allowed to withdraw the complaint with permission to avail himself of any other remedy which may be open to him. In my opinion, no such permission is necessary. If, however, permission is necessary, I would grant it and say that the complainant would be at liberty to avail himself of any other remedy which he may have in the matter.

11. In view of this, other objections raised by the opposite party need not be and are not gone into.

12. In the result, the complaint is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhandbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/I.]

S.R.O. 2716.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Harinath, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 41 OF 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman*.

PARTIES

Harinath S/o Garul, Road Gang Coolie, Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s
Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—
Complainant.

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery,
P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation,
Dhanbad—*For the Complainant*.

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a Road Gang colliie in the Kotma colliery belonging to the opposite party but was wrongfully expelled from service from 4th October 1953 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that it had dismissed the complainant and urged that the complainant left the colliery of his own accord.

4. At the hearing before me, the parties produced a memorandum of compromise arrived at between them. Under that compromise, the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is not to be paid any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period is, however, to be treated as on leave without pay and is not to constitute a break in service. I was told that at present there is no work of a Road Gang coolie and that is why the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is to be paid the same wages which he was getting before. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 41 OF 1954

PARTIES

Harinath S/o Garal.

Vs.

The management of the Associated Cement Co.'s Kotma Colliery

The parties above-named have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant will be taken up as a surface coolie on reporting for duty to the manager on or before 10th August 1954 on the same wages as he was getting before October 1953. He will not be entitled to any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period will be treated as on leave without pay and will not constitute as break in service.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 19th July 1954.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

Left Thumb impression of Harinath.

(Sd.) R. L. MAHVIYA, *for workman.*

Filed.

The 20th July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/II.]

S.R.O. 2717.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Terasia, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 42 of 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I. D. Act. 1947

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Terasia D/o Bhurra, Road Gang Reja, The Associated Cement Cos., Ltd.'s
Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—
Complainant.

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery,
P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federa-
tion, Dhanbad—*For the Complainant.*

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Com-
panies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that she was working as a Road Gang Reja in the Kotma colliery belonging to the opposite party but was wrongfully expelled from service from 4th October 1953 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that it had dismissed the complainant and urged that the complainant left the colliery of her own accord.

4. At the hearing before me, the parties produced a memorandum of agreement arrived at between them. Under that compromise, the complainant is to be taken up as a surface reja but she is not to be paid any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of her idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of her re-employment. This period is, however, to be treated as on leave without pay and is not to constitute a break in service. I was told that at present there is no work of a road gang reja and that is why the complainant is to be taken up as a surface reja but she is to be paid the same wages which she was getting before. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION No. 42 of 1954

PARTIES

Terasia D/o Bhurra

Vs.

The management of the Associated Cement Co.'s Kotma Colliery

The parties above-named have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant will be taken up as a surface reja on reporting for duty to the manager on or before 10th August 1954 on the same wages as she was getting before October 1953. She will not be entitled to any wages, D.A. or compensation for the period of her idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of her re-employment. This period will be treated as on leave without pay and will not constitute as break in service.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 19th July 1954.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

Left thumb impression of Terasia.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, for workman.

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, Chairman,

The 20th July 1954.

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/III.]

S.R.O. 2718.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Mandhari, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 38 of 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Mandhari S/o Munda, Road Gang Coolie, The Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainant.*

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a road gang coolie in the Kotma colliery belonging to the opposite party but was wrongfully expelled from service from 4th October 1953 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that it had dismissed the complainant and urged that the complainant left the colliery of his own accord.

4. At the hearing before me, the parties produced a memorandum of compromise arrived at between them. Under that compromise, the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is not to be paid any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period is, however, to be treated as on leave

without pay and is not to constitute a break in service. I was told that at present there is no work of a road gang coolie and that is why the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is to be paid the same wages which he was getting before. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 38 OF 1954

PARTIES:

Mandhari S/o Munda, Road Gang Coolie

Vs.

The management of the Associated Cement Co.'s Kotma Colliery

The parties abovenamed have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant will be taken up as a surface coolie on reporting for duty to the manager on or before 10th August 1954 on the same wages, as he was getting before October 1953. He will not be entitled to any wages, D.A. or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period will be treated as on leave without pay and will not constitute as break in service.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 19th July 1954.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, *for workman*.
Left Thumb Impression of Mandhari.

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/IV.]

S.R.O. 2719.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Hari, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION NO. 51 OF 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman*.

PARTIES

Hari S/o Mudia, Road Gang Coolie, Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant*.

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainant.*

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a Road Gang Coolie in the Kotma colliery belonging to the opposite party but was wrongfully expelled from service from 4th October 1953 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that it had dismissed the complainant and urged that the complainant left the colliery of his own accord.

4. At the hearing before me, the parties produced a memorandum of agreement arrived at between them: Under that compromise, the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is not to be paid any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period is, however, to be treated as on leave without pay and is not to constitute a break in service. I was told that at present there is no work of a road gang coolie and that is why the complainant is to be taken up as a surface coolie but he is to be paid the same wages which he was getting before. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD.

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 51 OF 1954

PARTIES

Hari s/o Mudia

Vs.

The management of the Associated Cement Co.'s Kotma Colliery.

The parties abovenamed have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant will be taken up as a surface coolie on reporting for duty to the manager on or before 10th August 1954 on the same wages as he was getting before October 1953. He will not be entitled to any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of his idleness from 4th October 1953 to the date of his re-employment. This period will be treated as on leave without pay and will not constitute as break in service.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 19th July 1954.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

Left Thumb impression of Hari.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, *For Workman.*

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*

Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

The 20th July 1954.

[No. LR.2(365)/V.]

S.R.O. 2720.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Ramsia, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 25 of 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Ramsia S/o Kalika Prasad, Road Gang Mate, Associated Cement Companies Limited's Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainant.*

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a road gang mate and that his services were terminated from 15th October 1953 by giving him a retrenchment notice on 1st October 1953 during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party urged that the services of the complainant became unnecessary on the construction of a railway siding and hence they were retrenched.

4. After the hearing of the case had proceeded to some extent, the parties entered into a compromise. Under the compromise, the complainant does not press his claim for reinstatement but he is to be paid Rs. 200 in satisfaction of all his claim against the opposite party. He has also withdrawn all allegations made by him in this case. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 25 of 1954

Ramsia S/o Kalika Prasad—*Complainant.*

Vs.

Associated Cement Companies Limited's Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma—*Opposite Party.*

The parties abovenamed have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant does not press his claim for reinstatement.
2. The management agree to pay Rs. 200 (two hundred only) to the complainant on or before 10th August 1954 in payment of all claims of the complainant against the opposite party. After the payment is made, the complainant will have no claim whatsoever of any kind against the opposite party.

3. The complainant withdraws all the allegations made by him in this case.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 21st July 1954.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

(Sd.) RAMSIA.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, for workman.

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

The 21st July 1954.

[No. LR.2(365)/VI.]

S.R.O. 2721.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Basist and three others, workmen of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman*.

PARTIES

Basist S/o Ramgarib, Sheoprasad S/o Munda, Panchbahadur Singh S/o Mahanand Singh, Mohammad Umar S/o Sekh Rasul, Miners, Associated Cement Cos. Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainants*.

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, Vice-President, Indian National Mine Workers Federation, Dhanbad—*For the Complainants*.

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personal Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainants alleged that they were working as miners in the Kotma Colliery belonging to the opposite party but were expelled from service on different dates in May 1953 during the pendency of reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that it had dismissed the complainants but urged that the complainants left the colliery of their own accord.

4. At the hearing before me, the parties produced a memorandum of compromise entered into between them. Under the compromise, the complainants are to be reinstated in their old jobs but are not to be paid any wages, dearness allowance, or compensation for the period of their idleness. This period of absence is,

however, to be treated as on leave without pay and is not to constitute a break in service. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT
DHANBAD

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION No. 30 OF 1954

PARTIES

Basist and three others

Vs.

The management of the Associated Cement Co.'s Kotma Colliery.

The parties abovenamed have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complaints will be taken up in the old job on their reporting to the manager on or before 10th August 1954 and will be paid at the same rates as they were getting before.

2. They will not be entitled to any wages, D.A. or compensation for the period of their idleness. The period of absence will be counted as on leave without pay and will not constitute a break in service.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 19th July 1954.

(Sd.) BASIST,

(Sd.) PANCH BAHADUR SINGH.

Left Thumb Impression of:—

Mohammed Umer,
Sheoprasad.

(Sd.) R. N. SINGH, General Manager, Kotma Colliery.

(Sd.) R. H. RANGA RAO, Senior Personnel Officer.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, *for workmen.*

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

The 20th July 1954.

[No. LR.2(365)/VII.]

S.R.O. 2722.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Ismail Noor Mohammad, a workman of the Kotma Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 50 OF 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952).

In the matter of an application u/s 33A of I.D. Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Ismail Noor Mohammed, Peon, The Associated Cement Companies Limited's Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Complainant.*

Vs.

The management of Associated Cement Companies Ltd.'s Kotma Colliery, P.O. Kotma, Dist. Shahdol, Vindhya Pradesh—*Opposite Party.*

APPEARANCES

No appearance on behalf of the Complainant.

Shri R. H. Ranga Rao, Senior Personnel Officer, Associated Cement Companies Limited, Bombay—*For the Opposite Party.*

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a peon under the opposite party, and that he was wrongfully discharged and expelled on 4th October 1953, during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952, without the permission of this Tribunal.

3. The opposite party denied that they had expelled or dismissed the complainant. They urged that the complainant was appointed as a guest house cook but was found unsuitable for the job and so he was maintained as a spare cook and also was asked to work as a relieving chowkidar. He was asked to work as a Magazine Chowkidar in the place of a chowkidar who was to go on leave. The complainant did not carry out this order and stayed away from work from 4th October 1953, and absented himself without permission. It was therefore urged that there was no breach of Section 33 of Industrial Disputes Act. The opposite party has also urged that there was no dispute, much less an industrial dispute, between them and their workmen.

4. The complainant, though informed of the date, was absent on the date of hearing. Mr. Malviya who held an authority from him informed me that he had sent information to the complainant and that the complainant may be late and I should wait for two days. I accordingly did so, but the complainant has not turned up till now. In the circumstances, as there is no evidence in support of the complaint, and as the complainant is absent, the complaint must be dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman.*

Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. LR.2(365)/VIII.]

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2723.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Ram Charan, a workman of the West Jhagrakhand Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 54 OF 1954

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application u/s 33A of I.D. Act 1947

PRESENT.

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman.*

PARTIES

Ram Charan, Pump Driver of West Jhagrakhand Colliery, P.O. Jhagrakhand Colliery, Dist. Surguja, Madhya Pradesh—*Complainant*.

Vs.

The Manager, West Jhagrakhand Colliery, P.O. Jhagrakhand Colliery, Dist. Surguja, Madhya Pradesh—*For the Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, President, Chhatisgarh Colliery Workers Federation, Chirimiri, Dist. Surguja, Madhya Pradesh—*For the Complainant*.

Shri T. N. Lahiri, Assistant Secretary, Jhagrakhand Collieries Limited, Singhi Par, Ballygunge, Calcutta-19—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a pump driver in the West Jhagrakhand Colliery and was dismissed by the opposite party on 23rd October 1953 without the express permission from this Tribunal as reference No. 6 of 1952 was then pending before it.

3. The opposite party urged that the complainant had committed several acts of misconduct as detailed in the written statement. In spite of several opportunities being given to him, he did not improve his conduct. His conduct caused considerable loss to the opposite party. Ultimately he was discharged.

4. At the hearing, the parties produced a memorandum of compromise entered into between them. Thereunder the complainant did not press for his claim for his reinstatement. He has been paid Rs. 125 in payment of all his claims against the opposite party. He has also been allowed to continue to stay in his quarters upto 6th August 1954. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable.

I therefore pass an award in terms of the compromise, a copy of which is attached herewith.

The 23rd July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 54 OF 1954

Ram Charan—*Complainant*.

Vs.

West Jhagrakhand Colliery—*Opposite Party*.

The parties above named have entered into a compromise as under:—

1. The complainant does not press his claim for reinstatement.

2. The management have paid Rs. 125 (one twenty five) to the complainant, and the payment thereof is hereby acknowledged by the complainant, in payment of all claims of the complainant against the opposite party and the complainant hereby declares that he has no claim whatsoever of any kind against the opposite party except that the unpaid wages of the complainant lying to his credit in the books of the management will be paid to him on his approaching the management.

3. The complainant who is in possession of quarters allotted to him by the opposite party will be allowed to stay there without rent upto 6th August 1954 and would thereupon vacate possession and hand it over to the management.

It is requested that an award in terms of the above compromise may please be passed.

Kotma, the 21st July 1954.

(Sd.) T. N. LAHIRI

(Sd.) B. ADHIKARI.

(Sd.) RAM CHARAN.

(Sd.) R. L. MALVIYA, for workman.

(Sd.) R. K. DUBEY.

The 21st July 1954.

Filed.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, Chairman,
Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.
[No. LR.2(365)/II.]

New Delhi, the 16th August 1954

S.R.O. 2724.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Prem Raj, a workman of the West Bokaro Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION NO. 191 OF 1953

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application u/s 33A of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A., LL.B.—*Chairman*

PARTIES

Shri Prem Raj, Loco Driver, West Bokaro Colliery, C/o Shri P. C. Chakraborty, Secretary, West Bokaro Colliery Workers' Union, P.O. Ghatotand, Dist. Hazaribagh—*Complainant*.

Vs.

The Management of West Bokaro Colliery, M/s. Anderson Wright & Co., P.O. Ghatotand, Dist. Hazaribagh, Bihar—*Opposite Party*.

APPEARANCES

Prem Raj, Complainant in person.

Shri S. S. Mukherjea, B.Sc., B.L., Pleader, Dhanbad—*For the Opposite Party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he had been dismissed by the opposite party illegally and wrongfully during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 1952 without the permission of this Tribunal and had thereby contravened the provisions of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

3. The opposite party urged that the complainant was a loco driver and while on duty on 22nd September 1952, he was found to have recklessly driven a loco motive which caused derailment and severe damage to it. A charge sheet wa-

served on him on 25th September 1952 to which he gave a reply admitting that he was driving the locomotive at a high speed; but he tried to put the blame on the underground in charge for asking him to do so. The opposite party was satisfied that the complainant was guilty and therefore dismissed him.

4. It is an admitted fact that the complainant was working as loco driver in the West Bokaro Colliery of the opposite party. It is alleged that on 22nd September 1952 he was driving a loco recklessly and this caused derailment and severe damage to it. A charge sheet was served on him and in reply thereto, the complainant stated that he was driving the locomotive at a higher speed under the orders of the underground in charge, for earlier dispatch of coal and for avoiding demurrage of waiting wagons. The management passed an order on 29th September 1952 dismissing him and this has given rise to the present complaint which has been filed on 21st July 1953.

5. There can be no doubt that the opposite party committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. On 29th September 1952 the date on which the complainant was dismissed, Reference No. 6 of 1952 was pending before this Tribunal. The opposite party and their workmen were parties thereto. Hence under Section 83 of the Industrial Disputes Act, the opposite party could not have dismissed any of its workmen without the permission of this Tribunal. No such permission was obtained. It is therefore clear that the opposite party committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

6. It was however urged that the dismissal of the complainant was justified. The allegation against him was that he was driving a loco recklessly, which caused an accident. It was not disputed before me that an accident was caused by the complainant who was driving a 100 h.p. loco on 22nd September 1952. He however argued before me firstly that he had no authority to drive a 100 h.p. loco and that he was authorised only to drive a 68 h.p. loco and still he was made to drive a 100 h.p. loco. Secondly it was urged that he drove the loco at a higher speed because he was asked by the underground in-charge to do so, with a view to avoiding demurrage of waiting wagons.

7. So far as the first point is concerned, there is no evidence before me about it. Neither in the reply to the charge sheet nor in his complaint to this Tribunal, the complainant has stated that he had authority to drive only a 68 h.p. loco, or that in spite of this he was made to drive a loco of 100 h.p. Had he made this allegation either in the reply to the charge sheet or in the complaint before this Tribunal, the opposite party could have produced evidence to show that this allegation was not true. Actually the complainant did not go into witness box even to support this allegation. His oral contention on this point raised for the first time at the time of arguments cannot be believed.

8. It was then urged that he was driving the loco at a higher speed because he was asked to do so by the underground in-charge. In this connection, the management have examined Mr. J. C. Agarwal, who was then in charge of the first shift and was also working as underground-in-charge on that day. He has denied that he asked the complainant to drive the loco fast. He has also stated that there was no necessity for them to send greater amount of coal outside the mine. In other words, there was no necessity for him to have instructed the complainant to drive the loco at a fast speed. The complainant has led no evidence—not even his own deposition—to support this allegation made in his reply to the charge sheet that he drove the locomotive at a higher speed under orders of the underground-in-charge. I hold that it cannot be believed.

9. In the course of the cross examination of Mr. Agarwal, the complainant suggested that Mr. Agarwal was not underground-in-charge at that time, but that one Mr. Sinha was then the underground-in-charge. The complainant even suggested that Mr. Agarwal did not go to the scene of accident for more than two hours after the accident. These suggestions also cannot be believed. The opposite party has produced before me its shift-in-charge report book. It shows that on 22nd September 1952, Mr. Agarwal was in charge of the first shift; in this book, he has made a report about the accident caused by the complainant by driving the loco at a high speed. This book also shows that Mr. Sinha was in charge of the third shift that day. In other words, Mr. Sinha could not have been in charge in the first shift when the accident occurred. The suggestion made by the complainant in this respect therefore is not true.

10. In the course of the hearing, the complainant even alleged that he had not admitted in his reply to the charge sheet that he drove the locomotive at a higher speed, and the copy of his reply produced by the opposite party was not correct.

The management was thereupon called upon to produce the original charge sheet with the reply of the complainant thereon. They have done so. The complainant admitted his signature on the reply but he then said that the reply was not read out to him. This reply must have been got written by him. The management had no hand in it. His allegation made orally at the time of hearing that the reply was not read out to him cannot be believed.

11. The reckless speed with which the complainant was driving the loco can be seen from the fact that though he was then going upgrade, the loco skidded a distance of about 15 yards after it had derailed and headed against two sides of the gallery. This shows that the loco must have been driven at a very high speed. A loco driver is expected to be careful while driving a loco. He should not go at an excessive speed, even under the directions of his superior officers. In the present case, I am not satisfied that there were any such orders. I hold that the complainant was guilty of reckless driving of the loco, which resulted in heavy financial loss to the management. That being so, the opposite party was justified in dismissing him.

12. In the result, the complaint fails and is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 31st July 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman*,
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.
[No. LR-2(365)/1.]

S.R.O. 2725.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the matter of an application under section 33A of the said Act from Shri Chhote Lal a workman of North Jhagrakhand Colliery.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT'S INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT DHANBAD

APPLICATION No. 32 OF 1954.

(arising out of Reference No. 6 of 1952)

In the matter of an application U/s 33A of I. D. Act, 1947.

PRESENT

Shri L. P. Dave, B.A.L.L.B.—*Chairman*.

PARTIES

Shri Chhotelal, Coal-cutter of North Jhagrakhand Colliery, P. O. Jhagrakhand Colliery, District Surguja, M. P.—*Complainant*.

Vs.

The Manager, North Jhagrakhand Colliery, P. O. Jhagrakhand Colliery, Dist. Surguja, M. P.—*Opposite party*.

APPEARANCES

Shri R. L. Malviya, President, Chhattisgarh Colliery Workers' Federation, P. O. Chirimiri, Dist. Surguja—*For the complainant*.

Shri T. N. Lahiri, The Assistant Secretary of the Jhagrakhand Collieries, Singhi Park, Bellygunge, Calcutta 19—*For the Opposite party*.

AWARD

This is a complaint under section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act.

2. The complainant alleged that he was working as a coal cutter in the North Jhagrakhand colliery of the opposite party. He further alleged that during the pendency of Reference No. 6 of 52, the opposite party dismissed him in October 1953 without the permission of this Tribunal and thereby committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act. It was alleged that the complainant had asked for 15 days' leave on learning of his mother's death but he was granted leave for 7 days only. The complainant returned from leave within 15 days and reported himself for duty but the manager did not allow him to join on the ground that he had overstayed his leave. He therefore filed the present complaint claiming reinstatement and payment of wages for the period of idleness.

3. The opposite party contended that the complainant had asked for leave for seven days and the same was granted to him from 18th September 1953. Even before this, he had not reported for work between 1st September 1953 and 18th September 1953. He also did not join his duties on the expiry of the leave nor did he apply for extension of leave. He wanted to rejoin the duty for the first time on 19th October 1953. As he had lost his lien on his appointment, he was not re-appointed to his post. It was therefore urged that the opposite party had not committed a breach of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

4. It is an admitted fact that the complainant was working as a coal cutter in the North Jhagrakhand colliery belonging to the opposite party. In his deposition before this Tribunal, he has said that about 10 months ago he had asked for leave for 15 days to go home as his mother was dead and the manager had granted that leave to him. He further said that he enjoyed 13 days leave, returned on 14th day and approached the manager but he was not allowed to rejoin his duties, in spite of several requests. On the other hand, the opposite party urges that the complainant was granted leave for 7 days and that he did not report for duty for almost a month.

5. The allegation of the complainant that he had been granted leave for 15 days is not true. In an application made by him to the Manager on 28th October 1953, he had stated that he had applied for 15 days leave but was granted leave for 7 days and that he was late by 4 days in joining his duties. In the complaint before this Tribunal also, he had stated that he had asked for leave for 15 days but he was granted leave for 7 days only. Thus the present allegation that he had been granted leave for 15 days as applied for by him cannot be believed.

6. In this connection, we have also the evidence of clerk D. N. Mukherjee who has stated that the complainant had approached him and requested that he wanted leave for 7 days and accordingly he wrote a chit to the Assistant Manager about it. This leave was granted. The Chit written by the clerk to the Assistant Manager with his order granting 7 days leave has been produced in this case and it corroborates the evidence of the clerk. I am thus satisfied not only that the complainant had been granted leave for 7 days but also that he had applied for leave for 7 days only. His allegations that he had asked for 15 days leave and that 15 days leave was granted to him are not true.

7. As leave was granted to the complainant for 7 days from 18th September 1953, he should have joined duty on 25th September 1953. The complainant has stated that he returned on the 14th day after enjoying leave for 13 days. I am not prepared to place any reliance on his testimony. As I said above, he has stated falsely that 15 days leave had been granted to him, though in the complaint itself, he admitted that leave was granted to him for only 7 days. I therefore do not accept his statement that he returned from leave on the 14th day after enjoying leave for 13 days only. On the other hand, we have the statement of clerk Mukherjee, corroborated by a slip written by him on 19th October 1953, showing that the complainant returned on 14th October 1953 and was offered a timber coolie's work but he refused to accept that work and that he again came on 19th October 1953 and was not allowed to resume work. In other words, the complainant over-stayed his leave by 20 days. Under the standing orders, a workman would lose his lien on his appointment, if he remained absent beyond the period of leave granted to him unless he returned within 8 days of the expiry of leave and gave reasonable explanation for the same. In the present case, as I said above, he did not return within 8 days of the expiry of the leave. At that time, he had lost lien on his appointment and it could not therefore be said that the opposite party committed a breach of section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act by not allowing him to resume his work. The opposite party had not been guilty of doing any act by which the services of the complainant were terminated but it was the action of the complainant himself which resulted in his losing the lien on his appointment. In my opinion, therefore, the opposite party has not committed a breach of Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act and hence the present complaint would not be maintainable.

8. Apart from this, the complaint would also fail on the ground that it has been made after an unreasonable delay. As I said above, the complainant has filed the present complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act alleging that the opposite party had committed a breach of Section 33 of the Act by dismissing him during the pendency of Reference 6 of 52. Section 33 of the Act prohibits an employer from discharging any workman concerned in any dispute which may be pending before a Tribunal without the express permission in writing from that Tribunal. Section 33A lays down that if an employer commits a breach of Section 33, the aggrieved employee may make a complaint in writing to the Tribunal. This section does not provide in express terms the time during which the complaint under that section should be made.

But it does not give a right to an aggrieved workman to make a complaint after an indefinite period. It is implicit in the section that the complaint must be made within a reasonable time of the Act complained of. The true position would be that a complaint under this Section must be made as far possible during the pendency of the proceedings and if it is made after such pendency, it should be made within a reasonable time. See the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal in the case of General Motors (India) Ltd., 1954, Vol. I, L.L.J., p. 676. It is true that this was a case under Section 23 of the Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Act 1950, but that section is similar to section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act and the principles laid down in the above case would also be applicable to the present case.

9. The award in Reference No. 6 of 52 was published in the *Gazette of India* dated 10th October 1953 and hence under Section 20 (3) read with Section 17A of the Industrial Disputes Act, the proceedings in that case must be deemed to have concluded from 10th November 1953. The present complaint has been filed on 15th March 1954, that is, more than 4 months after the conclusion of these proceedings. The delay on the face of it appears to be unreasonable.

10. Mr. Malviya on behalf of the complainant alleged that the matter was pending before the Regional Labour Commissioner for conciliation and that is why the complainant had not approached this Tribunal earlier, and that he now did so as the conciliation proceedings had failed. There is however nothing to show that the complainant had approached the Regional Labour Commissioner or the Conciliation machinery. Even in his deposition the complainant has not said anything about it. He has not stated that he had approached the Regional Labour Commissioner nor has he shown as to when the conciliation proceedings ended. The contention therefore that the delay in making the complaint was due to the complainant having approached the Regional Labour Commissioner cannot be accepted.

11. In any case, the complaint fails and is dismissed.

I pass my award accordingly.

The 31st July, 1954.

(Sd.) L. P. DAVE, *Chairman,*
Central Government's Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad.

[No. • LR-2(365)/II.]

P. S. EASWARAN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2726.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1947 (XXXII of 1947), read with rule 3 of the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Rules, 1949, and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. M-3(18)50, dated the 17th April, 1951, as subsequently amended, the Central Government hereby constitutes with effect from the 17th August 1954, an Advisory Committee consisting of the following members, namely:—

1. Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, *Chairman.*
2. The Coal Mines Labour Welfare Commissioner, *Vice-Chairman.*
3. The Chief Inspector of Mines.
4. The Commissioner, Burdwan Division, West Bengal, *Nominated by the Government of West Bengal.*
5. The Commissioner, Chotanagpur Division, Bihar, *Nominated by the Government of Bihar.*
6. The Labour Commissioner, Madhya Pradesh, *Nominated by the Government of Madhya Pradesh.*
7. Shri J. W. N. Baldock and 8. Shri G. M. Ray, *Nominated by the Indian Mining Association.*
9. The Coal Superintendent, Dhanbad, *Nominated to represent the State Railway Collieries.*

10. Shri N. B. Lall Singha, *Nominated by the Indian Mining Federation.*
11. Shri M. G. Chaora, *Nominated by the Indian Colliery Owners' Association.*
12. Dr. M. S. Katro, *Nominated by the Madhya Pradesh Mining Association.*
13. Shri Devan Sen, 14. Shri Kanti Mehta, 15. Shri R. L. Malviya, 16. Shri Mahesh Desai, 17. Shri K. Somayajulu and 18. Shri Chinmoy Mukherjee, *Nominated by the Central Government to represent the interests of the workmen employed in coal mines.*
19. Shrimati Geeta Narsingh, *Nominated by the Central Government.*
20. Mr. T. G. Walker, *Nominated on the recommendation of the Indian Mine Managers' Association.*
21. Shri S. Rakshit, *Nominated on the recommendation of the National Association of Colliery Managers.*

[No. M.3(5)/54.]

S.R.O. 2727.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 30 of the Minimum Wages Act, 1948 (XI of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendments shall be made in the Minimum Wages (Central) Rules, 1950, the same having been previously published as required by the said section.

In the said Rules—

1. In rule 22, after the word "Notices" where it occurs for the first time, the words, figure and letter "in form IX A", shall be inserted.

2. After form IX, the following form shall be inserted, namely:—

"FORM IXA"

Notices (Rule 22)

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINIMUM WAGES ACT 1948 AND THE RULES MADE THEREUNDER

I. Whom the Act affects

1. (a) The Act applies to persons engaged on scheduled employments on specified class of work in respect of which minimum wages have been fixed.

(b) No employee can give up by contract or agreement his rights in so far as it purports to reduce the minimum rates of wages fixed under the Act.

II. Definition of Wages

(1) 'Wages' means all remuneration payable to an employed person on the fulfilment of his contract of employment. It excludes—

- (i) the value of any house—accommodation—supply of light, water, medical attendance or any other amenity or any service extended by general or special order of the appropriate Government;
- (ii) Contribution paid by the employer to any Pension Fund or Provident Fund or under any scheme of Social Insurance;
- (iii) the travelling allowance or the value of any travelling concession;
- (iv) the sum paid to the person employed to defray special expenses entailed on him by the nature of his employment;
- (v) Gratuity payable on discharge.

(2) The Minimum rate of wages may consist of—

- (i) a basic rate of wages and a special allowance called the cost of living allowance.
- (ii) a basic rate of wage with or without a cost of living allowance and the cash value of any concessions, like supplies of essential commodities at concession rates;
- (iii) an all inclusive rate comprising of basic rate, cost of living allowance and cash value of concession, if any.

3. The minimum wages payable to employees of scheduled employments notified under section 5 read with section 3 or as revised from time to time under section 10 read with section 3 may be—

- (a) a minimum time rate,

- (b) a minimum piece rate
- (c) a guaranteed time rate,
- (d) an over-time rate;

differing with (1) different scheduled employments, (2) different classes of work, (3) different localities, (4) different wage periods and (5) different age groups.

III. *Computation and conditions of payment*

The employer shall pay to every employee engaged in scheduled employment under him wages at a rate not less than the minimum rate of wages fixed for that class of employee.

The minimum wages payable under this Act shall be paid in cash unless the Government authorises payment thereof either wholly or partly in kind.

Wage periods shall be fixed for the payment of wages at intervals not exceeding one month.

Wage shall be paid on a working day within seven days of the end of the wage period or within ten days if 1000 or more persons are employed.

The wages of a person discharged shall be paid not later than the second working day after his discharge.

If an employee is employed on any day for a period less than the normal working day he shall be entitled to receive wages for a full normal working day provided his failure to work is not caused by his unwillingness to work but by the omission of the employer to provide him with work for that period.

Where an employee does two or more classes of work to each of which a different minimum rate of wages is applicable, the employer shall pay to such employee in respect of the time respectively occupied in each such class of work wages at not less than the minimum rate in force in respect of each such class.

Where an employee is employed on piece work for which minimum time rate and not a minimum piece rate has been fixed, the employer shall pay to such employee wages at not less than the minimum time rate.

IV. *Hours of Work and Holidays*

The number of hours which shall constitute a normal working day shall be—

- (a) in the case of an adult, 9 hours,
- (b) in the case of a child, 4 hours.

The working day of an adult worker inclusive of the intervals of rest shall not exceed twelve hours on any day.

The employer shall allow a day of rest with pay in every period of seven days. Ordinarily Sunday the first day of the week shall be the holiday.

When a worker works in an employment for more than nine hours on any day or for more than forty-eight hours in any week, he shall in respect of overtime worked be entitled to wages in scheduled employment other than agriculture, at double the ordinary rate of wages.

V. *Fines and Deductions*

No deductions shall be made from wages except those authorised by or under the rules.

Deductions from the wages shall be one or more of the following kinds, namely:—

- (i) **Fines:** An employed person shall be explained personally and also in writing the act or omission in respect of which the fine is proposed to be imposed and given an opportunity to offer any explanation in the presence of another person. The amount of the said fine shall also be intimated to him. It shall be such as may be specified by the Central Government. It shall be utilised in accordance with the directions of the Central Government;
- (ii) **Deductions for absence from duty;**

- (iii) Deductions or damage to or loss of goods entrusted to the employee for custody, or for loss of money for which he is required to account, where such damage or loss is directly attributable to his neglect or default. The employed person shall be explained personally and also in writing the damage or loss, in respect of which the deduction is proposed to be made and given an opportunity to offer any explanation in the presence of another person. The amount of the said deduction shall also be intimated to him. It shall be such as may be specified by the Central Government;
- (iv) deductions for house accommodation supplied by the employer;
- (v) deductions for such amenities and services supplied by the employer as the Central Government may by general or special order authorise. These will not include the supply of tools and protectives required for the purposes of employment;
- (vi) deductions for recovery of advances or for adjustment of over-payment of wages; such advances shall not exceed an amount equal to wages for two calendar months of the employed person and the monthly instalment of deduction shall not exceed one-fourth of the wages earned in that month;
- (vii) deductions of income-tax payable by the employed person;
- (viii) deductions required to be made by order of a court or other competent authority;
- (ix) deductions for subscriptions to and for repayment of advances from any provident fund;
- (x) deductions for payment to co-operative societies or to a scheme of insurance approved by the Central Government.

VI. Maintenance of Registers and Records

Every employer shall maintain a register of wages specifying the following particulars for each period in respect of each employed person.

- (a) The minimum rates of wages payable.
- (b) The number of days in which over-time was worked.
- (c) The gross wages.
- (d) All deductions made from wages.
- (e) The wages actually paid and the date of payment.

Every employer shall issue wage slips containing prescribed particulars to every person employed.

Every employer shall get the signature or the thumb impression of every person employed on the wage-book and wage-slips.

Entries in the wage-books and wage-slips shall be properly authenticated by the employer or his agent.

A muster Roll shall be maintained by every employer and kept in the form prescribed.

Every employer shall keep exhibited at such places selected by the inspector, notices in English and in language understood by a majority of the workers of the following particulars in a clean and legible form—

- (a) Minimum rate of wages.
- (b) Extracts from the Acts and the Rules made thereunder.
- (c) Name and address of the Inspector.

VII. Inspections

An Inspector can enter in any premises and can exercise powers of inspection (including examination of documents and taking of evidence) as he may deem necessary for carrying out the purposes of the Act.

VIII. Claims and Complaints

Where an employee is paid less than the minimum rates of wages fixed for his class of work, or less than the amount due to him under the provisions of this Act, he can make an application in the prescribed form within six months to the

authority appointed for the purpose. An application delayed beyond this period may be admitted if the authority is satisfied that the applicant had sufficient cause for not making the application within such period.

Any legal practitioner, official of a registered trade union, Inspector under the Act or other person acting with the permission of the Authority can make the complaint on behalf of an employed person.

A single application may be presented by or on behalf of any number of persons belonging to the same factory the payment of whose wages has been delayed.

A complaint regarding less payment of notified wages under section 22 of the Act can be made to the court only with the sanction of the Authority within one month of the grant of such sanction.

A complaint under section 22 of the Act can be made to the court only by or with the sanction of an Inspector within six months of the date on which the offences is alleged to have been committed.

IX. Action by the Authority

The Authority may direct the payment of the amount by which the minimum wages payable exceed the amount actually paid together with the payment of compensation not exceeding ten times the amount of such excess. The Authority may direct payment of compensation in cases where the excess is paid before the disposal of the application.

If a malicious or vexatious complaint is made, the Authority may impose a penalty not exceeding Rs. 50 on the applicant and order that it be paid to the employer.

Every direction of the authority shall be final.

X. Penalty for Offence under the Act

Any employer who pays to any employee less than the amount due to him under the provisions of this Act or infringes any order or rules in respect of normal working day, weekly holiday, shall be punishable with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months or with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees or with both.

Any employer who fails to maintain a register or record required to be maintained under section 18, shall be punishable with fine which may extend to five hundred rupees.

XI. Minimum Rates of Wages Fixed

Name of undertaking.....

Serial No.	Category of employees	Minimum Wages
------------	-----------------------	---------------

XII. Name and Address of the Inspector(s)

Name	Address
------	---------

New Delhi, the 11th August 1954

S.R.O. 2728.—In pursuance of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (XXXIV of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. S.R.O. 1209, dated the 6th April 1954, namely:—

In the said notification, for item No. (20) the following item shall be substituted, namely:—

"(20) Shri R. K. Parikh, Manager, Shree Ram Mills, Ltd., Ferguson Road, Parel, Bombay-13."

[No. SS.121(76) (ii).]

New Delhi, the 16th August 1954

S.R.O. 2729.—In pursuance of section 4 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (XXXIV of 1948), the Central Government hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. S.R.O. 2155, dated the 16th November 1953, namely:—

In the said notification, for items No. 12 and 18, the following items shall be substituted respectively, namely:—

"12. Shri R. P. Kapur, I.C.S., Secretary to the Government of Punjab, Transport, Civil Supplies, Co-operative, Industries and Labour Departments, Chandigarh.

18. Shri N. K. Guruswamy, I.A.S., Joint Secretary to the Government of Hyderabad, Labour Department, Hyderabad."

[No. SS.121(80).]

K. N. NAMBIAR, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 13th August 1954

S.R.O. 2730.—In pursuance of the provisions of clause 9-A of the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1951, the Central Government hereby appoints in consultation with the Chairman of the Board, Shri H. V. Divatia, retired judge of the Bombay High Court and at present Vice-Chancellor of the Gujrat University, as an officer under that clause with the designation of "the Gangs Reorganisation Officer" for purpose of allocation of monthly gangs to the registered employers with effect from the date on which he assumes charge of his office.

[No. Fac.74(36).]

P. M. SUNDARAM, Dy. Secy.

